44837

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE / THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* JOAN IRIS TURNER

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* Edmonton and Vicinity Rural and Urban Youth: Differences in Evaluations of Occupations

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/*GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* Master of Science

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1978

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Daryll G. Murri

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* Aug. 21/78 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Joan Turner

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE* #204 - 10145 - 113 St
Edmonton
Alta.

NL-91 (3-74)

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NL-339 (Rev. 8/80)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

EDMONTON AND VICINITY RURAL AND URBAN YOUTH: DIFFERENCES IN EVALUATIONS OF OCCUPATIONS

by

© JOAN IRIS TURNER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

RURAL SOCIOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL ECONOMY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1978

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Edmonton and Vicinity Rural and Urban Youth: Differences in Evaluations of Occupations", submitted by Joan Iris Turner in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science.

Daryl L. Murri
Supervisor

.....

.....

.....

Date July 24, 1978

DEDICATED TO MY PARENTS,

WHO INSTILLED IN ME THE DESIRE TO ACHIEVE

ABSTRACT

In recognition of the need to test current theories of social stratification, to understand sub-sectors of society in relation to the whole, and to understand better the problems of rural youth vis-a-vis perceived barriers to higher occupational attainments, differences in rural and urban youth's evaluations of occupations were examined. A questionnaire survey was administered to a sample of 996 rural and urban grade twelve students, which yielded a 50.8 percent usable response.

The Davis-Moore theory of social stratification was examined, and tested in relation to the chosen sample. High correlations between prestige and difficulty of achievement scores lend strong support to the theory.

The Hodge, Treiman and Rossi structural-cultural view of occupational prestige, which attempts to account for persistently similar occupational prestige rankings across nations, was tested in relation to the sample. Results were inconclusive. More research is needed to strengthen or weaken the position of those investigators.

Rural youth overall tended to rate occupations in the semi-skilled, skilled, and unskilled categories higher than urban youth-- i.e., rural youth rate higher those occupations which they would have a reasonable chance of getting. Females tend to rate higher than males traditionally female occupations-- those in the helping, caring, teaching, and protective realms. Rural females rated higher than their urban counterparts those positions most likely available to them-- clerical jobs, and male occupations from the semi-skilled, skilled, and farming

categories-- occupations their future husbands are likely to attain. Both rural and urban females rated professional occupations higher than did urban males, perhaps reflecting a greater emphasis on higher education for these young women. Research indicating that occupations which people have the best realistic chance of achieving tend to be elevated is supported by this sample.

The prestige rankings of this sample of Edmonton and vicinity youth correlated moderately with those of the 1947 NORC study done in the U.S., and correlated highly with the international rankings of the 1956 Inkles and Rossi study. These findings lend support to researchers who have found that occupational prestige rankings tend to be similar across nations. Correlations were also very high with the 1967 Pineo and Porter study done in Canada, indicating that Edmonton and vicinity youth rate occupations similar to that of the rest of Canada.

Consistent with research which indicates that rural youth encounter greater barriers to higher occupational attainment than do urban youth, rurals appeared to have lower occupational expectations than their urban counterparts. Females overall tended to have higher expectations than did males. Urban males did not view themselves as lacking in knowledge of occupations (requirements for entry into, rewards for, and current positions available). Rural males lack knowledge in one area, current positions available. Urban females lack information on current positions available and rewards, and rural females lack knowledge of requirements for entry and rewards. Rural youth overall, when compared to urban youth overall, viewed themselves to have less understanding of requirements for entry into occupations. Rural youth overall, viewed the level of vocational counseling offered in their schools to be less adequate than urban youth. There

was no significant difference in adequacy of vocational counseling for males and females overall, nor when sex was linked with residence, excepting that rural females viewed their vocational counseling as less adequate than did urban males and females. For all groups, the occupations least known about were regional or industry specific such as troller and timber cruiser.

Research which has indicated that rural youth employ desiderata (something desired as essential when seeking a job) differently from urban youth which would prevent them from attaining higher level occupations is not supported. This, however, may be due to fact that this sample was of adolescents, rather than adults as other researchers have examined. The sample in this study was adolescents who appear to be most concerned neither with money, security, nor congeniality to individual interests, but rather with factors associated with personal identity and autonomy.

ACKNOLWEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to my supervisor, Daryll G. Murri for his guidance and encouragement. His help and patience were invaluable in overcoming many problems associated with the study. A special thanks is also extended to my committee members Dr. W.O. Schmidt and Dr. M.L, Lerohl, for their valuable contributions.

Finally, I wish to thank my fiance, Ray, for his endless reassurance and understanding during the course of my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
Chapter	
I THE SOCIOLOGICAL PROBLEM	1
Overview and Identification of the Problem	1
Utility of the Study	4
Statement of Objectives	4
The Hypotheses	5
II LITERATURE REVIEW	10
The Davis-Moore Theory	10
Summary of Davis-Moore	10
Critiques and Reply to Davis-Moore	12
Studies Relating to Social Stratification and Davis-Moore	22
Studies Relating to the Sociological Problem	25
Studies Relating to Sex Differences	32
III METHODOLOGY	34
The Study Area	34
Design of the Study	34
Sampling Procedures	35
Construction of the Survey Instrument	39
IV PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	43
Presentation of Results	43
Test of the Davis-Moore Theory of Stratification	43
Test of the Hodge, Treiman and Rossi Structural-Cultural View of Prestige	44
Edmonton Vicinity Rural/Urban Youth's Prestige Rankings and International Comparisons	47
Edmonton Vicinity Rural/Urban Youth's Prestige Rankings and a National Comparison	50
Rural/Urban Differences in Perceived Barriers	50
Sex Differences	56
Limitations of the Study	78
V CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	81
Conclusions	81
Implications	85

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	88
APPENDIX A	91
APPENDIX B	106
APPENDIX C	123

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Selection of the Sample by County	35
3.2	Response Trends of Questionnaire Mailouts by Schools	37
3.3	Response Trends by School	38
3.4	Response Trends by Sex	39
4.1	Edmonton Vicnity and Inkles and Rossi Occupational Prestige Comparisons	49
4.2	Rural/Urban Differences in Occupational Expectations	51
4.3	Rural/Urban Perceived Knowledge of Occupations	52
4.4	Rural/Urban Perceived Adequacy of Vocational Counselling	53
4.5	Rural/Urban Desiderata Rankings	55
4.6	Male/Female and Rural/Urban Correlations by Occupational Category	57
4.7	Rank-Order Correlations Overall Occupations by Sex and Residence	58
4.8	Sex Differences in Occupational Expectations	62
4.9	Male/Female Perceived Knowledge of Occupations	64
4.10	Female Urban/Female Rural Perceived Knowledge of Occupations	65
4.11	Male Urban/Male Rural Perceived Knowledge of Occupations	66
4.12	Female Urban/Male Rural Perceived Knowledge of Occupations	67
4.13	Female Rural/Male Urban Perceived Knowledge of Occupations	68
4.14	Male Urban/Female Urban Perceived Knowledge of Occupations	69
4.15	Male Rural/Female Rural Perceived Knowledge of Occupations	70
4.16	Male/Female Perceived Adequacy of Vocational Counselling	72
4.17	Female Urban/Female Rural Perceived Adequacy of Vocational Counselling	72
4.18	Male Urban/Male Rural Perceived Adequacy of Vocational Counselling	72
4.19	Female Urban/Male Rural Perceived Adequacy of Vocational Counselling	73
4.20	Female Rural/Male Urban Perceived Adequacy of Vocational Counselling	73
4.21	Male Urban/Female Urban Perceived Adequacy of Vocational Counselling	74
4.22	Male Rural/Female Rural Perceived Adequacy of Vocational Counselling	74
4.23	Desiderata Means	76
4.24	Desiderata Rankings	77
4.25	Desiderata Rank-Order Correlations by Sex and Residence	77

CHAPTER I

THE SOCIOLOGICAL PROBLEM

Overview and Identification of the Problem

This study is generally concerned with the question of social stratification-- i.e., with systems of "differentially valued positions"[1]-- within a society. Specifically, the study will examine and test a particular theory of social stratification, that offered by Davis and Moore, which attempts to account for the universality of stratification. The David-Moore theory of social stratification is a dominant theory in the area of stratification, and has been the subject of much controversy. It is a theory which states that certain positions in any society are functionally more important (to survival of that society) than are others. These positions require greater talent, training or skill than others. A scarcity of qualified personnel exists in any society. It is these two factors, functional importance and scarcity of personnel, which account for the emergence of a system of differentially valued positions in a society. Since society must fill its functionally important positions with talented and skilled personnel, differential rewards (primarily prestige and income) are attached to positions as inducement to fill them.

The author assumes that it is important to study social stratification since we live in a stratified society. Within a stratified social system, alternative role opportunities (for example, occupations) enable

---

[1] Paul K. Hatt, "Occupations and Social Stratification", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LV (July 1949-May 1950), p. 533.

movement up, down, and laterally. Occupations can determine placement in a class (status) division, which in turn inhibits or facilitates such movement. Class is not only "analysed by objective criteria such as income, property and so forth", but is-- "a subjective phenomenon experienced by actors in a social system".[1] "As the major roles through which rewards are distributed and power exercised, occupations are central to any study of stratification".[2]

This study also aims at testing the structural-cultural view of the occupational prestige hierarchy posited by Hodge, Treiman and Rossi.[3] In their comparative study of occupational prestige, these researchers note that both developed and underdeveloped nations have roughly similar occupational prestige hierarchies. Such is due to common social-structural features across societies, to specialized positions (for example, merchants and medical personnel) which are important to the functioning of those societies (for example, economics and public health). Every complex society has specialized positions to take care of economic, religious, health, political, and education functions, and in every society these positions are the most highly regarded. Inversions within narrow ranges of prestige positions are due to cultural differences.

> Thus,for example, cultural variation from society to society may cause inversions in the relative positions of physician and college professor, although in every society these two

---

[1] Peter C. Pineo, and John Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada," in James E. Curtis and William G. Scott, eds., Social Stratification: Canada (Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1973), pp. 61-62.

[2] W. Hodge, F.I. Treiman, and P.H. Rossi, "A Comparative Study of Occupational Prestige," in R. Bendix and S.M. Lipson, ed., Class, Status, and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), p. 309.

[3] Ibid., pp. 309-312.

occupations are among the highly regarded.[1]

This study will also compare the perceptions of Edmonton vicinity youth-- i.e., grade twelve students who are ready either to enter the job market, or to further their education-- with international and national perceptions of occupational prestige hierarchies.

A person's occupation influences much of his life, his chance for living "the good life". We live in a success-oriented society, and one in which one's position in the occupational hierarchy is often indicative of the measure of success he has achieved within his society. Accordingly, this study wishes particularly to look at perceived barriers to higher occupational attainment. Sources of perceived barriers are levels of occupational expectations, knowledge of occupations (availability of jobs, requirements for occupational entry, and rewards for jobs such as income, prestige and working conditions), level of vocational counseling offered differences in desiderata (the basis on which one chooses an occupation such as security or personal growth considerations), and perhaps sex.

It becomes of particular import to study rural-urban differences in occupational perceptions when one realizes that rural youth appear to be at a decided disadvantage in achieving high socioeconomic status occupations when compared with urban youth. Research findings indicate that rural youth encounter more barriers to high occupational achievement than do urban youth.[2] Owing to necessity rather than choice, over three-quarters of the rural youth population will have to migrate to urban areas where jobs are available. Rural youth have traditionally had a lower quality of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 311.

[2] Research findings referred to can be found in Chapter II of this thesis.

education and are less prepared to compete for jobs on the urban market than are their urban peers.

> Consequently, many rural youth who work in urban areas enter relatively low paid unskilled or semiskilled occupations. Few experience significant upward occupational mobility, or are able to bridge the gap from blue collar to white collar occupations, unless they first have successful periods in higher education.[1]

Utility of the Study

This study could have practical implications for delineating needs for vocational counseling. Further, if background data indicates a lack of knowledge about the various characteristics of jobs, educators could institute appropriate campaigns to educate high school students, such that the students can make preparation for entry into higher level occupations. This is the only study of its kind to be done in the Edmonton area. Most studies done in the area have concentrated on occupational aspirations. None have looked at sex differences. Others investigated only one area such as vocational planning (Ostaskewski, 1969), (Kreutz, 1968); expectations (Coulson, 1969); or information flow (Flaterud, 1973), (Roberts and Ackroyd, 1952), and (Nekolaichuk, 1970).

Statement of Objectives

This study has as its objectives the following:

1. To examine and test the Davis-Moore theory of social stratification vis-a-vis grade twelve students in Edmonton and vicinity;

2. To test the Hodge, Treiman, and Rossi structural-cultural view of occupational prestige hierarchies vis-a-vis rural and urban grade twelve

---

[1] Donald J. Blackburn and Patricia L. Storey, "A Crisis for Rural Youth," Agrologist, Vol. 21 (Jan-Feb 1973).

students in Edmonton and surrounding area;

3. To compare occupational prestige rankings of rural/urban Edmonton and vicinity youth with international prestige rankings;

4. To compare occupational prestige rankings of rural/urban Edmonton and vicinity youth with a national prestige ranking;

5. To examine rural/urban differences in perceived barriers, namely, occupational expectations, knowledge of occupations (current positions available, understanding of requirements for entry and understanding of rewards), adequacy of vocational counseling, and desiderata;

6. To examine rural and urban sex differences, in prestige rankings, expectations, knowledge of occupations (current positions available, understanding of requirements for entry and understanding of rewards), adequacy of vocational counselling and desiderata.

The Hypotheses

This study is meant to test hypotheses in the areas which follow:

Test of the Davis-Moore Theory

The author wishes to test the applicability of the Davis-Moore theory of social stratification to the sample--rural and urban grade twelve students within a one-hundred mile radius of Edmonton, Alberta. If the theory is valid, the prestige and difficulty continuums should match.[1]

Test of the Structural-Cultural View of Prestige

As noted, the structural-cultural view of Hodge, Treiman, and Rossi states that occupations will be ranked similarly in terms of prestige. Differences in ranking will be small, inversions occurring of

---

[1] Damian F. Hannon and J. Allan Beegle, "Evaluations of Occupations by Irish Rural Adolescents on the Basis of Prestige and Difficulty of Achievement," Rural Sociology, Vol. 34 (1969), p. 339.

within, rather than between, major categories of occupations.[1]

Edmonton Vicinity Rural/Urban Youth's Prestige Rankings and International Comparisons

It is intended to compare the prestige rankings of this sample of rural and urban youth with those of the 1947 NORC study[2] which was done in the United States, and with those of the 1956 Inkles and Rossi study[3] which compared popular prestige rankings in Germany, U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Great Britain, Japan, and New Zealand. The prestige rankings are expected to be similar.

Edmonton Vicinity Rural/Urban Youth's Prestige Rankings and a National Comparison

This sample of rural/urban youth will be compared, in terms of prestige rankings, with the prestige rankings of the 1967 Pineo and Porter study[4] done in Canada. No significant differences in rankings are predicted.

Rural/Urban Differences in Perceived Barriers

Recent research (as noted) indicates that rural youth expect to attain high prestige occupations less frequently than do urban youth,

---

[1] W. Hodge, F.J. Treiman, and P.H. Rossi, "A Comparative Study of Occupational Prestige," in R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset, ed., Class, Status, and Power, (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 309-321.

[2] Paul K. Hatt, "Occupations and Social Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LV (July 1949-May 1950), pp. 515-533.

[3] A. Inkles and P.H. Rossi, "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LVI (July 1955-May 1956), pp. 329-339.

[4] Peter C. Pineo and John Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada," in James E. Curtis and William G. Scott, ed., Social Stratification: Canada (Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1973), pp. 55-68.

that they have less knowledge of occupations, that they receive less adequate vocational counselling, and that they employ different desiderata when seeking employment than do urban youth. This study will test these research findings in relation to the selected sample.

Expectations-- It is hypothesized that there will be significant differences between rural and urban occupational expectations and that rurals will have lower occupational expectations.

Knowledge of Occupations-- It is expected that there will be significant differences between rurals and urbans in knowledge of current positions available, understanding of requirements for entry into occupations, and understanding of rewards for occupations. Rurals are expected to have less knowledge in the stated areas.

Perceived Adequacy of Counselling-- Significant differences are predicted between rural and urbans in relation to perceived adequacy of counselling, rurals will perceive themselves to have less adequate vocational counselling.

Differences in Desiderata-- Rural and urban youth are expected to employ different desiderata when seeking an occupation, specifically rural youth will more often emphasize direct economic consideration, while urban youth will significantly more often emphasize "the goal of congeniality to the individual's interests.[1]

Sex Differences

Sex Differences in Prestige Rankings-- No significant differences are predicted between male and female rankings in general, nor when sex is linked with the rural/urban variable.

---

[1] Herbert H. Hyman, "The Value System of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification", in R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset, ed., Class, Status, and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), p. 492.

Sex Differences in Expectations-- It is hypothesized that rurals, both male and female, tend to have lower expectations than do urban males and females.

Sex Differences in Understanding of Current Positions Available-- Both males and females of the rural sample are expected to have less knowledge of current positions available than do urban males and females.

Sex Differences in Understanding of Requirements for Entry into Occupations-- It is predicted that both males and females in the rural sample have significantly less knowledge than do males and females in the urban sample.

Sex Differences in Understanding of Rewards for Occupations-- It is hypothesized that males and females in the rural sample have less knowledge of rewards for occupations than both sexes in the urban sample.

Sex Differences in Perceived Adequacy of Counseling-- Both males and females of the rural sample are expected to perceive that they have less adequate vocational counseling than those in the urban sample.

Sex Differences According to Desiderata-- Differences are predicted between males and females overall, and between males and females in the urban and in the rural sample. Rural youth are expected to emphasize direct economic considerations, while urbans emphasize individual interests.

The Variables

The variables classified as independent in this study are rural/urban residence, sex, and difficulty of achievement evaluations. The dependent variables are prestige evaluations, expectations, knowledge of occupations (availability, requirements for entry, and rewards), perception of adequacy of vocational counseling and desiderata. Age and level of education (years of school) are controlled for.

LEAF 9 OMITTED IN PAGE NUMBERING.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Davis-Moore Theory

As mentioned, occupation is one dimension of stratification. The Davis-Moore theory notes that no society is truly unstratified. This theory attempts to account for stratification on the basis of the "systems of positions" in terms of "functional necessity". Davis and Moore state that:

> The main functional necessity explaining the universal presence of stratification is precisely the requirement faced by any society of placing and motivating individuals in the social structure. As a functioning mechanism a society must somehow distribute its members in social positions and induce them to perform the duties of these positions.[1]

Summary of Davis-Moore

Davis and Moore essentially say that there are certain positions in any society which are functionally more important to the maintenance of that society than are others. For example, religion performs an important integrative function for society as it exercises control over, and posits values for, that society. Government organizes society through law and authority. Such positions require special skills greater training, or talent than other positions. Davis and Moore recognize that it is difficult to really establish functional importance, but suggest two criteria by which we can judge the functional importance of a position-- a) uniqueness of the position, which is the extent to which

---

[1] K. Davis, and W.E. Moore, "The Continuing Debate on Equality-- Some Principles of Stratification," American Sociological Review, Vol. 10, No. 2 (1945), p. 47.

the position cannot be effectively interchanged with another (for example, religious, economic, political and educational functions are each maintained in distinct structures within a society-- structures which cannot be effectively interchanged), and b) the extent to which a position is in a relationship of interdependence with other positions.

Not only are there differences in the functional importance of positions in any society, but so too is there differential scarcity of qualified personnel. Qualification is obtained through inherent capacity or training. Inherent capacity may be rare in the populations, or training may be long, arduous, and costly, so that entrants to positions are limited. Members of the population need to be induced to enter functionally important positions-- i.e., such positions must offer sufficient reward to draw qualified personnel. The two determinants of differential reward are then, scarcity of personnel and functional importance. Davis and Moore delineate rewards as those things that contribute to sustenance and comfort, humor and diversion, and self-respect and ego expansion. These rewards are dispensed differentially according to importance of the positions. Rewards are built into positions-- i.e., they are the rights and prerequisites associated with the particular positions. Rights and prerequisites (associated with differentials in prestige and esteem) are viewed as necessarily unequal in a society. Social inequality is then, a system unconsciously derived by society in order to fill necessary positions competently.[1]

It should be noted that Davis and Moore's original assertion of 1945, which said that stratification ensured the most important positions

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 47-51.

be filled by the ablest and best trained personnel, was withdrawn in later exposition of the theory (1948) due to much sociological evidence to the contrary, i.e., situations in which status is "prepared by position and efforts of parents, status is ascribed rather than achieved, status is influenced by group determinants". Much sociological evidence pointed to the fact that those with equal talent do not necessarily have equal opportunity to acquire positions of high prestige and income.[1]

Critiques and Reply to Davis-Moore

Many writers have criticised the Davis-Moore theory on many and varied grounds, a representation of which is offered herein. Perhaps the most ardent critic of Davis and Moore has been Melvin Tumin.[2] He says that the Davis-Moore postulate that some positions in society are "functionally more important" than others is vague and confusing. "Functional importance" is, he says, intuitive and unmeasureable. In addition, Tumin insists that scarcity of personnel is inadequate as a determinant of stratification, for some societies actually restrict the development of talent and skills (for example, through differential access to education). Tumin goes on to say that there are functional equivalents (alternatives) to unequal rewards as motivators to fill positions. He suggests that "intrinsic job satisfaction" or "social duty" could work just as well as inducers to fill positions.[3]

---

[1] W. Wesolowski, "Some Notes on the Functional Theory of Stratification," in Bendix, R. and S.M. Lipset, Class, Status and Power, (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 64-69.

[2] Melvin M. Tumin, "Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis," The American Sociological Review, Vol. 18 (August 1953), pp.53-58.

[3] G.A. Huaco, "The Functionalist Theory of Stratification: Two Decades of Controversy," Inquiry, Vol. 1, No. 9 (Spring 1966), p. 218. (Published by Universfelsforagt, Oslo, Norway.)

In reply to Tumin, Davis (1953)[1] asserts that Tumin has ignored the 1948 version of the theory. Tumin says "functional importance" is intuitive and unmeasureable, which ignores the 1948 exposition of "clues" to measuring the phenomenon, i.e., uniqueness and degree of dependence. Tumin charges that Davis and Moore do not account for restriction of talent in the population. Davis says that such restriction is accounted for by his addition of the ascriptive dimension in the 1948 version. Furthermore, the Davis-Moore theory is really concerned with positions themselves, rather than how individuals get into those positons-- i.e., by achievement or by ascription. Tumin posits functionally equivalent motivators (alternative motivators), i.e., intrinsic job satisfaction and social duty, to Davis-Moore's inequality of rewards. Davis asserts that altruism is quite inadequate as a means of eliciting socially adequate behavior, and that most of the population would end up in very few positions if everyone did just what gave them joy. He says that social duty, and intrinsic job satisfaction are supplementary rather than alternative to differential rewards.

In Tumin's "Reply to Kingsley Davis" (1953)[2], Tumin questions that the universality of a phenomenon implies that it is positively functional or necessary. He posits that there are many universals which provide built in limits on human efficiency, for example, poverty and war. He asserts that social inequality may be more dysfunctional than functional. Davis does not deny such, but merely attempts to explain the functional aspects of inequality. Davis contends that since social inequality is universal, it must be in some sense functional.

---

[1] Kingsley Davis, "Reply to Tumin," The American Sociological Review, Vol. 18 (August 1953), pp. 59-62.

[2] Melvin Tumin, "Reply to Kingsley Davis," The American Sociological Review, Vol. 18 (December 1953), pp. 672-673.

Other writers reply to Tumin. Lopreato and Hazelrigg (1972)[1] assert that Tumin's exposition of conditions under which stratification is limiting rather than positively functional is irrelevant to the theory itself. A truly complete theory would have taken into account dysfunctions as well as eufunctions, but failing to do so does not seriously detract from the theory. Lopreato and Hazelrigg point out that Tumin and Davis and Moore may be exhibiting different concerns in discussion of stratification. While Davis and Moore appear to be concerned only with utility of the society (survival value), Tumin is saying they should be concerned with utility for the society as well (concern for the welfare and satisfaction of society's members). What is ultimately important about Tumin's criticism is delineated by Huaco (1966).[2] Tumin succeeded in drawing attention to the possibility of the presence of functional alternatives, which would destroy the predictive powers of the theory.

Wesolowski (1962)[3] questions the Davis-Moore assumption that social stratification is functionally necessary and therefore a universal aspect of society. He also examines the Davis-Moore criterion for determining functional importance, i.e., uniqueness and dependency. Differences can easily be found on the vertical plane but not on the horizontal. An example of the horizontal plane is where a doctor can perform a nurse's

---

[1] J. Lopreato, and Lawrence E. Hazelrigg, Class, Conflict and Mobility: Theories and Studies of Class Structure (U.S.A.: Chandler Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 110-112.

[2] George A. Huaco, "The Functionalist Theory of Stratification: Two Decades of Controversy," Inquiry, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring 1966), p. 220.

[3] W. Wesolowski, "Some Notes on the Functional Theory of Stratification," in Bendix R. and S.M. Lipset (ed), Class, Status, and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 64-69.

duties. Vertically, the doctor and the engineer have qualitatively different training; the duties of one cannot be filled by the other. Wesolowski says that the functional uniqueness of a position may not really add anything new since greater prestige is attached to positions that require unique training in the first place. Dependency however, does add something new, for the idea of dependency involves the idea of authority-- some positions are subordinate to others. We can glean an idea of how functionally important a position is by how much authority it carries.

Like Tumin, Wesolowski questions that differences of prestige and income are necessary for filling positions, especially in societies in which statuses are ascribed. The theory, he says, is applicable only to achievement based societies. Also, like Tumin, Wesolowski addresses himself to the question of functional alternatives. The motive for behavior depends on the values and conditions in the culture in which one is raised. There may also be differential emphasis on means and ends. Davis and Moore contend that individuals are motivated to obtain an education and develop authority as a means to achieve prestige and material reward. Education and authority could be ends in themselves however. Davis and Moore in their statement assert that stratification is universal because it is a functional prerequisite. They fail to account for possible alternatives such as egalitarian values or that a social hierarchy could be built on authority rather than prestige and material advantage.

Simpson (1957)[1] notes major criticisms of other writers of the theory and attempts to modify the theory. Basically, his objections to the

---

[1] Richard L. Simpson, "A Modification of the Functional Theory of Stratification," Social Forces, Vol. 35 (1957), pp. 132-136.

theory are: a) the theory implies that stratification is good and necessary simply because it exists; b) there are positions in existence such as servant, mistress, and motion picture star which appear to be disproportionately rewarded considering the training necessary to fill such a position and the importance of such a position to society at large; and c) it is difficult, perhaps even impossible, to evaluate the importance of a particular position.

That stratification is good and necessary simply because it exists is a very Darwinian (survival of the fittest) type of approach, and fails to recognize that societies can quite well tolerate patterns which are neutral or somewhat maladaptive. The criterion of functional importance-- i.e., uniqueness and dependency-- appear to be inadequate. Functional uniqueness is dependent on public opinion regarding uniqueness, not on a sociologist's decision about whether society can actually do without the position or the person filling it. There appear to be positions in which rewards are not equal to importance.

Simpson suggests that one substitute a "supply and demand" type of analysis for "functional necessity", the demand for a certain position is rewards-- monetarily and otherwise, and scarcity of personnel can be viewed as supply. Rewards are easier to measure than importance. Training and talent, including restriction of, and monopolies on, can be seen as factors affecting supply. Factors affecting demand are cultural values, technology, and power to reward.

Simpson questions the Davis-Moore criterion of functional importance on the basis that there is no one-to-one correspondence between it and differential rewards. Although functional importance is difficult to measure, *what Simpson forgets is that* functional importance is only one

of the determinants of unequal rewards. The other is scarcity of personnel, the factor which could account for his observation that there is often no one-to-one correspondence.[1] Simpson's modification of the theory in terms of supply and demand is an interesting alternative.

Huaco's (1966)[2] examination of the 1945 and 1948 versions of the theory of stratification posited by Davis and Moore pointed to the major modification in the 1948 version--where the 1945 version appeared to be applicable to a purely competitive order, i.e., to positions attained by achievement only, the new version attempted to account for a non-competitive order, i.e., a society in which positions are ascribed rather than achieved. Davis and Moore in their 1948 version posted an achievment/ascriptive continuum. Achievement and ascription represented polarities and every society, in actuality, would be of mixed types. Davis and Moore see the family as the cause of status ascription. It is this status ascription that prevents partially, or fully in some societies, the movement of the best trained or talented persons into the most highly rewarded and functionally important positions within a particular society.

Huaco also examines the postulates of the theory. He finds the postulate of differential functional importance to be unclear and concludes that it is untestable and therefore invalid as an explanatory postulate. In reference to "clues" for determining functional importance, Huaco asserts that there is no basis for seeing uniqueness and dependency as indicators of anything except themselves. The assumption that positions

---

[1] George A. Huaco, "The Functionalist Theory of Stratification: Two Decades of Controversy," Inquiry, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring 1966), p. 221.

[2] Ibid., pp. 215-239.

of the greatest functional importance tend to receive the highest rewards and that they require the highest talent and training are also questionable. They are really untestable, for one cannot use talent, training or rewards as indicators of functional importance. He also points out that although societies which fill their most highly rewarded positions with the best talented or trained people may be more "rational and just", no evidence exists to say that achievement societies are stronger or that they survive longer than societies wherein ascription is the rule. The premise that unequal rewards attached to positions are the cause of the mobility of persons into positions is a solid one says Huaco, for there is lots of evidence which emanates from psychological "reinforcement" (learning) theory which indicates that humans as well as animals respond (act) in reference to positive (high rewards) and negative (low rewards) reinforcement.

All critics in general, say Lopreato and Hazelrigg,[1] fail to recognize that the Davis-Moore theory is ideal in nature, i.e., the theory claims "universal validity" under ideal conditions which means under conditions of "free competition" in the labor market. If such free competition is lacking, inherited privileges will produce a discrepancy between the functional importance of positions and rewards received in those positions. In the ideal, conditions of supply and demand meet exactly. When they do not, functional importance is "artifically altered", for creation of an excess or inadequate supply of personnel brings along excessive or inadequate rewards in relation to functional importance of the position. The problem for critics of the Davis-Moore theory comes in

---

[1] J. Lopreato, and Lawrence E. Hazelrigg, Class, Conflict and Mobility: Theories and Studies of Class Structure. (U.S.A.: Chandler Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 109-110.

trying to move from the ideal to the actual.

The Davis-Moore theory of stratification is a functional one. Functionalism is a theoretical orientation in sociology which is based on the assumption that all major societal processes operate to maintain integration or stability of the larger system. The functionalist explanation per se is concerned with the causes and consequences of social equilibrium in society. It is one way of looking at societal processes, at society. A problem in looking at society from the functionalist view overall is that it tends to reify societal processes, i.e., those processes assume a life of their own independent of persons taking part in those processes. Such a view reverses man in relation to his environment and tends to dehumanize his world, for he ultimately feels that he has no control over his social organization. To say that stratification is an unconscious societal process which operates to ensure survival of that society is to reify. While reification of societal process appears to be a problem of the functionalist position in general, practical application appears to be a problem of the Davis-Moore theory in particular. In addition to the problems stated by afore mentioned critics such as determination of functional importance and disproportionate allocation of rewards to particular positions, one must note that high status rewards may not only induce the most talented to fill positions, but may also provide inducement for those who are most corrupt to enter those positions. One must also note difficulties encountered in terms of practical application of the theory; examples such as the People's Republic of China definitely fly in the face of the Davis-Moore functionalist explanation of stratification, for in that society the attempt is to equalize rewards among positions, and it does not appear that that society is having trouble filling its positions.

While the Davis-Moore theory has experienced considerable criticism, it has too received support. Stinchcombe's study (1963)[1] is concerned with empirical consequences of the Davis-Moore theory. Stinchcombe suggests ways to test the Davis-Moore theory. For example, since the abilities of Generals become more important in wartime, rewards of that particular military elite should rise above others which have little to do with victory, such as the medical elite. As Huaco (1966)[2] points out, Stinchcombe's example of Generals in wartime is really an inadequate test of the theory, for Davis-Moore were looking at importance of positions in the same time, not two different times (wartime and peacetime) as Stinchcombe does. Nevertheless, an effort was made to demonstrate that functional importance really exists and can be tested.

Simpson and Simpson (1960)[3] declared support for the Davis-Moore theory. Their study obtained ratings from zero to 100 for the amount of responsibility (according to difficulty, number, and scope of decision making), personal autonomy (how free a person is to decide how to do his job) and training, education, and skill attached to some ninety different occupations. Correlations were .95 training, education, and skill with prestige, and .93 responsibility with prestige. There was a high correlation of .91 between training, education, and skill with responsibility.

---

[1] Arthur, L. Stinchcombe, "Some Empirical Consequences of the Davis-Moore Theory of Stratification", American Sociological Review Vol. 28, (1963), p. 805-808.

[2] George A. Huaco, "The Functionalist Theory of Stratification: Two Decades of Controversy," Inquiry, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring 1966), pp. 230-234.

[3] Richard L. Simpson, and Ida Harper Simpson, "Correlates and Estimation of Occupational Prestige," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXVI (July 1960 - May 1961), pp. 134-140.

Findings are consistent with the Davis and Moore theory of stratification which maintains that occupations requiring the greatest amount of talent and training (training, education, and skill in Simpson and Simpson's terms) also have the greatest "functional importance" (degree of responsibility to Simpson and Simpson's terms).

Lopreato and Lewis (1963)[1] examined the relationships between reward, prestige, skill, and functional importance. They asked 185 high school students from Las Vegas, Nevada and Amherst, Massachusetts to rate flour identical lists of 24 occupations according to each of the four variables. Occupations came from unskilled, skilled, professional, gambling, commercial, and educational categories. Findings revealed that correlations between functional importance and other variables were lowest, which did not appear to support the David and Moore theory. There was close correlation between skill and prestige, and skill and reward which does support the theory. There was a close relationship between prestige and reward. They suggested that the low correlation between functional importance and the rest of the variables may be due to respondents not really wanting to rate occupations on the variable of importance but ranking occupations according to their "moral value", rather than functional importance (gambling was rated very low in Las Vegas, yet contributes a great deal to the community). Further partial correlation analysis revealed that prestige is the "fulcrum variable". Lopreato and Lewis themselves state the problems with their study. Fristly, the sample was limited in size and range. Secondly, their definition of functional importance may not have been comprehended by the students and thirdly, students may not

---

[1] J. Lopreato, and Lionel S. Lewis, "An Analysis of Variables in the Functional Theory of Stratification", The Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Winter 1963), pp. 301-310.

have been familiar with the occupational roles.

The Davis-Moore theory has received its share of critics as well as supporters. The issue is far from being settled.

Studies Relating to Social Stratification and Davis-Moore

Studies dealing with social stratification in general and those meant to test the Davis-Moore theory in particular are numerous and varied. Only those considered most applicable to the present study are cited.

The study done by C.C. North and P.K. Hatt (NORC study) in 1947[1] has been by far the most influential study of occupational prestige. In 1947, National Opinion Research Centre interviewers conducted a survey of the American public designed to get at people's attitudes towards various occupations. The public was asked to evaluate 90 different occupations according to a five point scale. The occupations were subsequently ranked according to a particular weighting procedure. The researchers found that the chief factors in prestige were highly specialized training and responsibility for public welfare. Rankings that were classified from highest to lowest in terms of prestige were: Government Officials; Professional/Semi-professional workers, Proprietors, Managers and Officials (not farm); Clerical, Sales and related workers; Craftsmen, Foremen and related workers; Farmers and Farm Managers; Protective Service Workers; Operatives and related workers, Farm Laborers; Service workers (except domestic and protective); and Laborers (except farm).

Some differences in ratings were noted. All sections of the country (North-East, Mid-West, West, and South) were found to be in

---

[1] Cecil North and Paul K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in Wilson, Logan and William L. Kolb, Sociological Analysis (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949), pp. 464-474.

agreement. Non-farm laborers were lower in the Midwest and South Professional, Semi-professional and Government Officials were high in the Northeast and low in the Midwest. Differences among regions were small. It was found that as the size of place decreased, job ratings decreased. Artistic, Scientific, and Communication occupations were given higher ratings in metropolitan areas, while farm related jobs rated higher in smaller places. Respondent's occupation affected occupational ratings in that one tended to rate those occupations which were theirs, or closely related to theirs, more highly. Ratings were fairly parallel across age groups and sexes. Professions were rated higher by those in higher economic groups, semi-skilled and skilled were rated higher by the poorer classes. The most important considerations in choosing a career were found to be personality, individual qualifications, and interest. Families tended to have similar occupations.

Hodge, Siegel and Rossi (1966)[1] concerned themselves with a replication of the original NORC study, along with other studies previously done to provide a time-series observation in changes in occupational prestige in the U.S.A. from 1925 to 1963. They found no great changes in prestige to 1963. There was a net upward shift among all blue collar occupations; a net downward shift in Managerial, Clerical and Sales, with Professions remaining the same; and a slight downward shift in farming. Changes were small-- i.e., prestige remained very stable over time. Such changes as were noted were attributed to a possible increase in public knowledge about occupations.

---

[1] R.W. Hodge, P.M. Seigel, and P.H. Rossi, "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963," in Bendix, R. and S.M. Lipset (ed), Class, Status, and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 322-334.

Hodge, Treiman, and Rossi (1966)[1] presented descriptions of twenty-four studies of occupational prestige for different countries, gave a summary of sample and technical characteristics of the studies, and compared their prestige hierarchies. The authors found a substantial agreement between the U.S. hierarchy and those of other countries. These researchers attribute similarities in prestige hierarchies to common social-structural features across societies, to common specialized positions considered important to the functioning of all societies-- those positions which take care of economic, religious, health, political, and educational functions.

Inkles and Rossi (1956)[2] compared popular prestige rankings of occupations in six different countries-- Germany, U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Great Britain, Japan, and New Zealand. Findings indicated high correlations between the six countries. The authors concluded that people rank occupations in a relatively standard hierarchy even though cultural differences are present. The tendency toward this standard hierarchy of occupations is attributed to universal features of the industrial occupational system.

Hannan and Beegle (1969)[3], working with Irish rural adolescents, dealt with the subjective evaluation of relative prestige and difficulty of achievement. If the theory of functional stratification actually works,

---

[1] W. Hodge; D.J. Treiman, and P.H. Rossi, "A Comparative Study of Occupational Prestige," in Bendix, R. and S.M. Lipset (ed), Class, Status, and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 309-321.

[2] A. Inkles, and P.H. Rossi, "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXI (July 1955 - May 1956), pp. 329-339.

[3] F.D. Hannon, and J.A. Beegle, "Evaluations of Occupations by Irish Rural Adolescents on the Basis of Prestige and Difficulty of Achievement," Rural Sociology, Vol. 34 (1969), pp. 327-342.

the two continuums should match. The researchers found that they did not, and suggested the theory was in need of some modification.

The Pineo and Porter (1967)[1] study was the first study of occupational prestige for Canada, and was in addition, a bilingual one. Occupational titles from other studies were changed to make them representative of Canada. Investigators found a slight tendency for jobs to be rated higher in Canada than in the U.S. The French showed a tendency to sort jobs into the middle categories more frequently then English Canadians or Americans. The French tended to elevate rankings for Clerical, Sales and blue-collar jobs, while ranking "superior" white-collar jobs lower. This is a pattern similar to that found in lower income groups by investigators such as Reiss in the U.S. and Hall and Jones in Great Britain. The investigators posit that this pattern may be due to a tendency to downgrade occupations which one feels are unattainable, and to upgrade those which one can have a reasonable expectation of acquiring.

Studies Relating to the Sociological Problem

Much research has pointed to the problem considered in this thesis. Concerning the problem of migration, Lipset (1955)[2] tested the relationship between occupational and geographic mobility. Secondary analysis was used on data from a previous study (the Oakland Mobility Study). Lipset's study revealed a definite continuing pattern, in which rural people migrated to larger centers where they take over low-status positions while native

---

[1] P.C. Pineo, and John Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada," in Curtis, E. James and W.G. Scott (ed), Social Stratification: Canada (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1973), pp. 55-68.

[2] S.M. Lipset, "Social Mobility and Urbanization," Rural Sociology, Vol. 20 (Sept. - Dec. 1955), pp. 220-227.

urbanites became upwardly noble. Freedman and Freedman (1956)[1], using data from a national sample survey conducted in 1952, found that one-third of non-farm people in the U.S. were farm-raised. These one-third were found to be concentrated in low-status positions. Low status was measured in terms of self-perception of class, income, education, or occupation. Burchinal and Jackson (1963)[2] studied intact white families in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Their study revealed that men from farm backgrounds were over represented in lower status occupations, even when the variables of education and age were controlled. Taeuber (1967)[3] collected residence histories from a 1958 national survey in the U.S.A. He concludes that off-farm migration is an important problem since less than one-third of farm-borns would still maintain farm residence by the age of 65 years. Bultena (1969)[4] studied people who transferred out of agriculture into the non-farm labor force in Prince County, Wisconsin. It was found that most of these ex-farmers had less problems adjusting to the non-farm labor force than did rural youth. Reasons for the difference lie in the fact that ex-farmers tend to migrate to smaller metropolitan areas and have had previous off-farm work experience.

---

[1] Ronald Freedman, and Deborah Freedman, "Farm-Reared Elements in the Non-Farm Population", Rural Sociology, Vol. 21, (March 1956), pp. 50-61.

[2] Lee G. Murchinal and P.E. Jacobson, "Migration and Adjustments of Farm and Urban Families and Adolescents in Cedar Rapids, Iowa", Rural Sociology, Vol. 28 (Dec 1963), pp. 365-378.

[3] Karl E. Taeuber, "The Residential Redistribution of Farm-Born Cohorts", Rural Sociology, Vol. 32, No. 1 (March 1967), pp. 20-36.

[4] Gordon L. Bultena, "Career Mobility of Low-Income Farm Operators", Rural Sociology, Vol. 34, No. 4 (December 1969), pp. 563-567.

The Nekolaichuk thesis (1970)[1] addressed itself to the problem of migration and information flow. This three year, follow-up study concerning 194 grade twelve students from Minburn and Two Hills, Alberta, revealed that few graduates had anticipated having to leave their communities to seek employment. After three years, over one-third of them had found it necessary to do so. Uncertainty of occupational plans of high-school students can be attributed to lack of information upon which realistic planning could be based. Roberts and Ackroyd (1952)[2] studied post-school occupations of students from Alberta high schools. In this study of some 821 matriculants, these researchers concluded two main reasons for students not attending university-- lack of money and lack of information. Haller, Burchinal and Taves (1963)[3] discuss the complexity of occupational choice. They note that the problems of occupational choice are much more significant for rural youth who must make a bigger adjustment to non-farm work, who receive little occupational counseling, and who are, in general, less prepared than urban youth to compete effectively for jobs in the urban market.

Blau and Duncan (1967)[4], in examination of the occupational structure in the U.S., note that rural male migrants to urban centers achieve

---

[1] Demetro M. Nekolaichuk, "Student's Vocational Plans: A Three Year Follow-Up Study," (Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, Department of Educational Psychology, 1970), pp. 1-134.

[2] Wm. G. Roberts, and Ammon O. Ackroyd, "A Study of Post School Occupations of Students who Graduated From Alberta High Schools in 1949," (Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, Department of Educational Psychology, 1952), pp. 1-67.

[3] Archibald O. Haller; Lee G. Burchinal and Marvin J. Taves, Rural Youth Need Help in Choosing Occupations (East Lansing: Michigan State University, Agric. Exp. Stn., Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology 1963), pp. 1-18.

[4] Peter M. Blau, and Otis Dudley Duncan with the collaboration of Andrea Tyree, The American Occupational Structure (U.S.A.: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1967), pp. 274.

more occupationally than rural males remaining in rural areas. Rural men do less well in the cities than do urban men. This, they say, reflects not only better urban than rural occupational opportunities, but also indicates that men coming from rural areas to the city have inferior occupational preparation. Rural migrants move into the lower occupations in the hierarchy, providing additional upward mobility for urbanites.

Kreutz (1968)[1] did a study designed to determine factors related to realizability of occupational plans. It was found that the realizability of plans varied directly with education, levels of parent's education, the degree of uncertainty students felt about their plans, and the amount of information they had about their plans. Students in small places of residence (hamlets or villages under 500 in population) realized their plans less often than did students from larger areas of residence.

Concerning the problem of perception, Campbell and Mulvey (1962)[2] asked people in a community in Missouri their perception of employment opportunities in the area. The authors concluded that many people, especially low income groups, have perceptions of job opportunities, rewards, and requirements, which are distorted. Perceptions do not fit the facts, which further places these groups of people at a disadvantage in terms of employment. Lack of information and apathy presented the biggest problem for low-income groups.

Concerning the problem of expectations, Kuvlesky and Ohlendorf

---

[1] Norma Bertha Kreutz, "The Realizability of Vocational Plans of Grade Twelve Students in Alberta," (Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, Department of Educational Psychology, 1968), pp. 1-50.

[2] Rex R. Campbell, and Susan A. Mulvey, Perceptions of Job Opportunities Among Low Income Groups in Missouri (Columbia: Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Missouri 1962), pp. 3-9.

(1968)[1] studied occupational expectations of 98 rural and 111 urban black male, high school sophmores. They found that urban boys had higher expectation and goal levels (aspirations) than did rural boys. Differences were smaller for expectations than they were for goals.

Drabick (1974)[2] studied high school students in North Dakota in order to determine factors related to prestige of desired occupations (occupational aspirations), prestige of expected occupations (occupational expectations), educational expectations, relationship of respondent's residence to various factors, correlative relationships of respondent's sex and residence to various factors, and factors related to perceived importance of college education. In terms of occupational expectations, males expected occupations of high prestige more often than females. Females remained in the middle ranges. Students in pre-college preparation programs expected high prestige occupations more often. Students expecting to enter occupations by motive of altruism or rewards expected to attain high prestige occupations less frequently than those expecting to enter out of general interest. Those intending to migrate expected slightly more prestigious occupations. Attitude of parents was associated with level of expectation. An unfavorable attitude of the father toward expected occupations was associated with a decrease in numbers of those expecting high prestige occupations, and associated with an increase in those expecting a low prestige occupation. Occupational expectations decreased if a job was promised immediately after leaving high school. College

---

[1] William P. Kuvlesky, and George W. Ohlendorf, "A Rural-Urban Comparison of the Occupational Status Orientations of Negro Boys," Rural Sociology, Vol. 33 (1968), pp. 141-152.

[2] Lawrence W. Drabick, Factors Associated With Expectations: North Dakota High School Seniors, Educational Research Series No. 9 (Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State University, July 1974), pp. 1-36.

was perceived as important for boys planning non-farm careers, and for girls planning a career, but seen as unimportant or unnecessary for girls expecting to be housewives. Those perceiving college as important had higher occupational expectations in terms of prestige. Children of fathers who had high prestige occupations more often had higher occupational expectations. The amount of parent's education was positively associated with level of prestige of expected occupation.

In terms of sex differences, Drabick found that females selected occupations more often on the basis of altruism (service to humanity) than on rewards. Males tended to be less certain about entry into their expected occupations than females.

Regarding relationship of respondent's residence to various factors, Drabick noted that urbanites expected to enter higher prestige occupations more frequently than rurals. More rural residents were motivated towards occupations on the basis of general interest while urban students were motivated on the basis of potential reward. More rural than urban students considered migration necessary to occupational obtainment. Urban residents tended to be slightly more unsure of entry into expected occupations than farm residents. More urban than rural respondents expected to enter college. Educational attainment of parents was greater among urban than among farm residents.

In discussion of the correlative relationship of sex and residence to various factors, Drabick found that urban students appeared more knowledgeable about occupations, as indicated by fewer of them giving general interest as their reason for entry. Urban females displayed the greatest knowledge of occupations.

Caro and Pihlblad (1964)[1] compared students of various socio-economic classes on two dimensions--perceived accessibility of desired jobs and evaluation of occupations. They found that lower class students perceived limited access to higher prestige occupations, which tended to modify their job orientations. Class was determined by level of parental education and occupational attainment. No differences in occupational values were found.

Breton and McDonald (1956/66)[2] analyzed a representative sample of secondary school students across Canada in terms of occupational preferences. What the investigators observed in patterns of preferences and expectations was a result of information available to students. Such information was restricted to a narrow range of occupations. Patterns vary partly due to the amount and type of occupational information available and partly to conditions that structure the opportunities open to them (for example, one's program of study or parent's socio-economic position). It may be of interest to note, in this context, that Brinkerhoff (1972)[3] in studying barriers to occupational aspirations notes that perceived barriers are more important than actual barriers.

---

[1] Francis F. Caro, and C. Terrance Pihlblad, "Aspirations and Expectations-- A Re-Examination of the Basies for Social Class Differences in the Occupational Orientations of Male High School Students," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 49 (1964-1965), pp. 465-573.

[2] Raymond Breton, and John C. McDonald, "Occupational Preferences of Canadian High School Students," in Blishen, B.R., F.E. Jones, K.D. Naugele and J. Porter (ed), Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives (Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1971), pp. 185-211.

[3] Merlin B. Brinkerhoff, and Philip R. Kunz, "Some Notes on the Measurement of Perceived Barriers to Occupational Aspirations," Rural Sociology, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Sept 1972), pp. 436-441.

Hyman and Herbert (1966)[1] investigated different desiderata for the different classes (wealthy and prosperous, middle, and lower) in choosing occupations. The investigators found that lower class individuals tend to prefer occupations with desideratum (something desired as essential) of economic benefit rather than congeniality of work.

Richard Centers, in studying the nature of social classes (1949)[2] by way of the interviewing of a representative cross section of adult white males in the U.S., noted class differences with respect to desired jobs. Middle class people expressed a desire for occupations involving self-expression more often than did the working class, who more often sought an occupation involving security-- i.e., a job which they could be absolutely sure of keeping, and independence. Both middle and working classes of the rural population emphasized independence.

Studies Relating to Sex Differences

While studies dealing with social stratification in general, and occupational prestige in particular have been numerous and varied, remarkably few studies have dealt with sex differences in evaluation of occupations. Most studies have been on the national level and have used only male respondents or simply have not concerned themselves with sex differences. Examination of thesis records at the University of Alberta from record inception to the fall of 1977 yielded no studies considering sex differences in evaluation of occupations.

---

[1] Hebert H. Hyman, "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in Bendix R., and S.M. Lipset (ed). Class, Status and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 488-499.

[2] Richard L. Centers, Psychology of Social Classes (U.S.A.: Princeton University Press, 1941), pp. 151-152.

Hyman (1966)[1] in studying the value systems of different classes posited that value-systems create "self-imposed" barriers to improving one's position. Value systems differ among different social classes. Females are more likely to vary in their values as their class position changes.

Reiss, Duncan, et al. (1961)[2] look at sources of variation in prestige rating in the NORC (1947) study. Investigators found that females have less knowledge and experience of the labor force which may affect their prestige rankings. Females may grant more prestige to occupations favouring their entry. Little difference in rankings were found overall--only the high status female occupations were ranked higher by females than males (for example, arts and religious roles). Men placed a slightly higher evaluation on the managerial and proprietary occupations than women did.

---

[1] Hebert H. Hyman, "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in Bendix, R., and S.M. Lipset (ed), Class, Status and Power (New York: The Free Press, 1966), p. 490.

[2] Albert J. Reiss, Jr.; O.D. Duncan, P.K. Hatt, and C.C. North, Occupations and Social Status, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961), pp. 162-239.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The Study Area

The area selected for study was that within a one-hundred mile radius of Edmonton, Alberta. A map of Alberta counties was obtained, and a circle drawn to include all counties within the stated one-hundred miles. Schools were selected at random from within this area. The one-hundred mile outer perimeter was considered most reasonable in terms of accessability, travelling time, and cost.

Design of the Study

This study is expost facto in nature, effects of the variables have already occurred at the time of the study. It is not possible to make the causal inferences within reach of the true experimental condition. What is possible however, is to determine concomitant variation-- i.e., the way in which X and Y vary together, through correlation. There is, as with all correlational research, a problem of uncontrolled variables. An attempt was made to control for as many as possible. The correlational approach is considered useful and viable in terms of the present study, for it concerns a situation which already exists in time. In this study, two groups of students (rural, urban) are studied at the same point in time. Differences between the two groups are studied, and the question is asked: Can differences in prestige and difficulty rankings, occupational expectations, knowledge of occupations, perceived adequacy of vocational counselling, and desiderata be attributed to sex or residence?

Sampling Procedures

As mentioned the sample of the present study was selected from within a one-hundred mile radius of Edmonton, Alberta. A list of operating schools in Alberta, by population size and area, was provided by the Department of Education, Grants Division. Ten rural and two Edmonton City high schools were selected from the list provided according to random sampling techniques using a table of random numbers. Schools selected for study are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE BY COUNTY

Schools	County	County Number
Rural		
Thorhild	Thorhild	7
Ryley	Beaver	9
New Norway	Camrose	22
Ardrossan	Strathcona	20
San Gudo	Lac St. Anne	28
Thorsby	Leduc	25
New Sarepta	Leduc	25
Seba Beach	Parkland	31
Drayton Valley	Parkland	31
Hay Lakes	Camrose	22
Calmar	Leduc	25
Warburg	Leduc	25
Urban		
Ross Shepard		
Sherwood Park		

Warburg officials refused to participate in the study. Although Calmar did grant permission, and were mailed thirty questionnaires, the few that were returned (seven) arrived too late to be included in the study.

At first draft, early in the study, a pretest was done by issuing the questionnaire to ten persons of varying age and educational backgrounds. As a result of the pretest, the questionnaire was adjusted to compensate for complaints relating to size of print. In addition, the category "someone who lives off inherited wealth" was deleted from the difficulty of achievement ranking, since it made little sense in that context. The average time of completion of the questionnaire was found to be thirty-five minutes, a length of time deemed feasible for administration.

Upon completion of the revised questionnaire, the Superintendants of the selected schools were contacted with a request to administer them in schools under their jurisdiction, and were sent copies of the questionnaire itself. School principals were subsequently contacted to enlist their aid in administering them. Principals were then mailed the appropriate number of questionnaires with sufficient postage for their return. Follow-up telephone calls were made after two to four weeks if the questionnaires had not been returned. Samples of covering letters and the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A of this thesis.

Out of 996 questionnaires mailed out or delivered to the schools, 649 were returned for a response rate of 65 percent. Of the 649 returned, 143 were discarded as unusable due to incompletion or evidence of patterned response. All those which showed a tendency to avoid or to check extremes on the scales were discarded. Out of the total 996 questionnaires mailed out, 506 were usable, providing an overall response rate of 50.8 percent.

Only those questionnaires deemed usable are included in the analysis. A detailed summary of response trends is presented in Table 3.2 Note that due to rounding procedures, tables will not add up to 100 percent all of the time.

Table 3.2

RESPONSE TRENDS OF QUESTIONNAIRE MAILOUTS BY SCHOOLS

School	Number Mailed Out	Usable Returns	Unusable Returns	Overall Percent Usable Returns
Rural				
Thorhild	45	32	0	71.1
Ryley	20	19	0	95.0
New Norway	85	29	1	34.1
Ardrossan	75	68	0	90.7
San Gudo	28	21	1	75.0
Thorsby	35	19	4	54.3
New Sarepta	40	21	2	52.5
Seba Beach	12	10	0	83.5
Drayton Valley	138	16	0	11.6
Hay Lakes	68	12	3	17.6
Urban				
Ross Shepard	250	221	11	88.4
Sherwood Park	200	38	121	19.0
TOTAL	996	506	143	50.8

The low response rate of 11.6 percent for Drayton Valley and that of 17.6 percent for Hay Lakes cannot be accounted for except for the possibility that principals of the schools either asked for volunteers

and few students volunteered to participate, or that questionnaires were completed on a voluntary basis at home and few were returned. The low response rate for Sherwood Park of 19.0 percent is accounted for in the fact that the principal of that school administered questionnaires to grades ten, eleven, and twelve, only grade twelve responses were used for this study. The overall usable response rate for rurals and urbans by school as shown in Table 3.3 was 49.0 percent rural and 51.2 percent urban. Of the total 506 cases usable for analysis, 53.2 percent of the respondents were male and 46.8 percent female as shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.3

RESPONSE TRENDS BY SCHOOL

School	Absolute Frequency	Percent
Rural		
Thorhild	32	6.3
Ryley	19	3.8
New Norway	29	5.7
Ardrossan	68	13.4
San Gudo	21	4.2
Thorsby	19	3.8
New Sarepta	21	4.2
Seba Beach	10	2.0
Drayton Valley	16	3.2
Hay Lakes	12	2.4
TOTAL RURAL		49.0
Urban		
Ross Shepard	221	43.7
Sherwood Park	38	7.5
TOTAL URBAN		51.2
TOTAL	506	100.2

Table 3.4

RESPONSE TRENDS BY SEX

Sex	Absolute Frequency	Percent
Male	269	53.2
Female	237	46.8
TOTAL	506	100.0

Construction of the Survey Instrument

The final draft of the questionnaire was divided into four main parts. The first part was designed to gain descriptive information concerning characteristics of participants in the study such as age, sex, name of high school, number of years in school, program of study, place of residence, father's occupation, and education of parents.

In parts II and III of the questionnaire, respondents were first asked to rate 204 occupations on a scale of "excellent" to "poor" standing in terms of their own personal opinion of the social standing of those occupations. They were next asked to rate the same occupations, minus the category "someone who lives off inherited wealth", on a five point scale from "extremely difficult" to "not difficult" in terms of their own personal opinion of how difficult it would be to achieve that occupation. Ratings of these two lists of occupations provide the data for testing the Davis-Moore theory of social stratification.

The ranking according to prestige provides the data for testing the structural - cultural view of prestige hierarchies. As mentioned this view states that differences in prestige rankings will be small, inversions occuring only within, rather than between, major categories of

occupations.

The list of occupations used was adopted directly from the Pineo and Porter study.[1] This occupational list appeared comprehensive and representative of the Canadian labour force. In reference to the occupational title list, the occupation "hog farmer" was changed to "pig farmer" in view of the fact that Pineo and Porter noted a negative affect associated with the world "hog" in their study. Following Pineo and Porter, two non-existent occupations were added to the list, "biologer" and "archaeopotrist". If a large part of the sample responded "don't know", then it would be considered that they were taking the ranking task seriously. The total list of occupations were presented in random order.

The remainder of parts II and III of the questionnaire was devoted to questions designed to ascertain rural-urban differences in "perceived barriers" to attaining a higher level occupation. Four questions were designed to ascertain knowledge of occupations. These questions were derived by the researcher. The basic factors involved in each of the questions -- i.e., understanding of current positions available, requirements for entry into occupations, and rewards were derived from the writings of many researchers investigating occupational problems of rural youth. Respondents were asked to check the category of percent knowledge which they felt they had of "a good understanding of current positions available". The choices were 80 to 100 percent, 60 to 80 percent, 40 to 60 percent, 20 to 40 percent, and 0 to 20 percent. They were then asked to check the categories of percent in terms of "an excellent or very good understanding of requirements for entry into those occupations". The same

---

[1] P.C. Pineo, and J. Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada;" in Curtis, E. James and W.G. Scott (ed), Social Stratification: Canada (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1973), pp. 55-68.

categories were used in asking respondents to indicate percent of "excellent or very good understanding of rewards" for occupations. All three questions referred to percent knowledge the student felt he or she had regarding the same two hundred different occupations they had rated according to prestige and difficulty of achievement. Respondents were asked then to list the five occupations they had least knowledge of (taken from the original list of occupations presented for rating) with the occupation of very least knowledge at the top.

Perceived adequacy of occupational counseling was determined by asking respondents to rate the amount of occupational counseling provided by their school on a five point scale from "excellent" to "poor".

Differences in occupational expectations was determined by asking the respondent to specify the kind of occupation he really expected to have most of his life.[1]

Part IV of the questionnaire was designed to ascertain differences in desiderata (factors considered most important when choosing a career). Eleven factors were presented, and the students were asked to rate each factor on a five point scale from "very important" to "not important". The eleven factors presented included elements of leadership, interesting experience, esteem, power, security, self-expression, profit, fame, social service, independence, and personal growth. Questions were adopted from R. Center's study of psychology and social classes.[2]

---

[1] W.P. Kuvlesky, and G.W. Ohlendorf, "A Rural-Urban Comparison of the Occupational Status Orientation of Negro Boys," Rural Sociology, Vol. 33, (1968), p. 145.

[2] Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes: A Study of Class Consciousness (New York: Russel and Russel, 1961), pp. 151-152.

For presentation of limitations concerning methodology, the reader is referred to Chapter IV - Presentation of Results.

The remainder of this thesis will be concerned with analysis of data with a view to testing the hypotheses presented, presentation of findings, and conclusion to the study.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Presentation of Results

Test of the Davis-Moore Theory of Stratification

As mentioned if the Davis-Moore Theory is valid, prestige and difficulty continuums should match.

Prestige and difficulty of achievement scores were arrived at by averaging the rankings of students on a scale of one to five. For prestige ratings,one was "excellent (social) standing"; two , "good standing"; three, "average standing"; four, "below average standing"; and five was "poor standing". For difficulty of achievement ratings, one was "extremely difficult"; two, "very difficult"; three, "average difficulty"; four, "mildly difficult", and five was, "not difficult". Scores were transformed such that the higher the score, the higher the prestige or difficulty of achievement.

Scattergrams were obtained for the total sample (rural and urban together, and for the rural and urban samples separately showing prestige as a function of difficulty of achievement both by occupational category (professional, semi-professional, etc.) and by all occupations.

Comparing total prestige and total difficulty by all occupations showed a high positive correlation (R) of .96 at the 0.00001 level of significance. The r^2 was .93, 93 percent of the variation in prestige is explained by difficulty of achievement.

The scattergram comparing rural prestige with rural difficulty of achievement by all occupations yielded a positive correlation (R) of .96

at 0.00001 level of significance, with an r^2 of .91.

Comparing urban prestige with urban difficulty by all occupations showed R to be .97 at the 0.0001 level of significance, with an r^2 of .93.

By occupational category (Professional, Semi-Professional, etc.) comparing prestige and difficulty of achievement, scattergrams indicated a high positive correlation (R) of .98 at the 0.00001 level of significance, with an r^2 of .97 for the total sample (rural and urban together). For the rural sample alone R was +.97 at the 0.00001 level of significance, with an r^2 of .94. For the urban sample alone, R was +.99 at the 0.00001 level of significance, with 99 percent of the variation in prestige explained by difficulty of achievement.

In all cases of comparison, correlations between prestige and difficulty of achievement are extremely high and very significant. From 91 to 99 percent of the variation in prestige can be accounted for by difficulty of achievement. Scattergrams for the total sample and for rural and urban samples separately, both by all occupations and by occupational category, lend strong support to the Davis-Moore Theory of Social Stratification.

Test of the Hodge, Treiman and Rossi Structural-Cultural View of Prestige

In the view of Hodge, Treiman and Rossi,[1] occupations between groups will be ranked similarily in terms of prestige. Differences in ranking will be small, inversions occuring within, rather than between, major categories of occupations.

---

[1] R.W. Hodge, P.M. Seigel, and P.H. Rossi, "A Comparative Study of Occupational Prestige", in Class, Status and Power, ed. by Bendix and S.M. Lipset (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 309-321.

A scattergram comparing rural and urban prestige ratings by occupational category (Professional, Semi-Professional, etc.) showed an R of .996 at the 0.00001 level of significance, with an r^2 of .99. The correlation was nearly perfect. Categories of occupations were ranked the same for both groups: Professional; Proprietors, Managers, and Officials, Large; Semi-Professional; Farmers, Proprietors, Managers and Officials, Small; Skilled; Semi-Skilled; Clerical; and Unskilled.

Over all occupations, the correlation between rural and urban prestige was again highly positive, .98 with an r^2 of .96 at the 0.00001 level of significance.

Rural/Urban Prestige Evaluations by Occupational Category-- Rural and urban youth ranked occupations by category the same. Both groups, however, inverted the order of some categories compared to national studies. There are no major inversions at the top or at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy. Professionals remain at the top and skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled remain at the bottom. Inversions come in the middle range, with Proprietors, Managers and Officials, Large, being placed ahead rather than behind semi-professionals. The other inversion appears to be clerical which is placed after semi-skilled rather than in front of skilled. Studies such as that of Pineo and Porter[1] show the national Canadian evaluation to be Professional; Semi-Professional; Proprietors, Managers and Official, Large; Proprietors, Managers and Officials, Small; Clerical; Skilled, Semi-Skilled; and Unskilled. Farmers are in a category by themselves. Examination of means for each occupation within categories also showed inversions

---

[1] P.C. Pineo and John Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada", in Social Stratification: Canada, ed. by Curtis E. James and W.G. Scott, (Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1973), pp. 55-68.

within those categories. Hodge, Treiman and Rossi contend that the occupational hierarchies should show inversions only within, rather than between, major categories of occupations. There is impressive similarity in prestige hierarchies from country to country which these researchers attribute to common social-structural features across societies, to common specialized positions considered important to the functioning of all societies-- those positions which take care of economic, health, religious, political and educational functions.

The finding in this study, that the sample reversed the order of occupations between as well as within categories, cannot be used as evidence against the Hodge, Treiman, and Rossi study. Firstly, those occupations considered important to the functioning of most societies-- professionals, (economists, teachers, physicians, ministers, etc.) and large proprietors, managers, and officials (political leaders and larger buisnessmen)-- are still ranked at the top. Secondly, inversions in ranking from a sub-sector of society such as this sample may be a result of cultural variation vis-a-vis the rest of the country, and would tend to be obscured at the national level, the level at which Hodge, Treiman and Rossi are doing their comparisons. More studies would have to be carried out in order to strengthen or weaken the position taken by Hodge, Treiman and Rossi.

Rural/Urban Prestige Evaluation by Occupation-- T-Tests were performed on all ratings of prestige of occupations in order to determine significant differences in prestige scores between the rural and urban groups. In all cases the "F" value was examined to determine if variances could be considered to be homogeneous (equal) between the two groups. If "F" was not significant at the .05 level-- i.e., if the two-tailed probability was

$\geq$ .05, then variances were considered to be equal. 'T'-values were then examined to determine whether differences in means were significant, using the pooled variance estimate if variances were not significantly different, and using the separate variances estimate if variances were significantly different. In each case, if the two-tailed probability figure was $\geq$ .05, differences in means were not considered significant. If that same figure was $\leq$ .05, differences in means were considered significant.

The list of significant differences in prestige rankings by occupation can be found in Appendix B of this thesis. Rural youth tended to rate farming occupations higher than urban youth. They also tended to rate higher those occupations in the Small Proprietors, Managers, and Officials; Clerical; Skilled; Semi-Skilled and Unskilled categories. This may suggest that rural youth tend to rate higher those occupations to which they feel they have most accessibility. Urban youth rated only three occupations significantly higher than did rural youth; troller, musician in a symphony orchestra, and physician. Their higher rating of musicians in a symphony orchestra may reflect their greater accessibility as urbanites to the arts, and the higher rating of physician may reflect greater perceived accessibility to high prestige occupations.

Edmonton Vicinity Rural/Urban Youth's Prestige Rankings and International Comparisons

Edmonton Vicinity and the 1947 NORC Study-- Thirty-three occupations and prestige scores from the 1947 NORC Study[1] were matched with

---

[1] Cecil North and Paul K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation", in Sociological Analysis by L. Wilson and W.L. Kolb (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949), pp. 466-467.

occupational titles from the present study, and prestige scores compared for this sample of rural and urban youth. The rankings were expected to be similar. A list of occupations and prestige scores compared can be found in Appendix C. Twenty-eight out of these thirty-three occupations available for comparison come from the top three occupational categories, Professionals, Semi-Professionals and Large Proprietors, Managers and Officials.

A rank order correlation analysis yielded a Spearman correlation coefficient of 0.61 at the .001 level of significance. Thus, there is a moderately strong correlation between 1947 NORC prestige rankings and those of Edmonton and vicinity youth. Rankings were expected to be similar. The only moderate correlation found could be due to the small number of occupations used for comparison, to U.S. - Canadian or Canadian regional differences.

Edmonton Vicinity and the 1956 Inkles and Rossi Study-- Inkles and Rossi compared popular prestige rankings of occupations in six different countries-- Germany, U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Great Britain, Japan and New Zealand. Findings indicate high correlations between the six countries. The authors concluded that people rank occupations in a relatively standard hierarchy even though cultural differences are present.[1] The prestige rankings of Edmonton and vicnity youth were compared with those of the Inkles and Rossi study. Rankings were expected to be similar. Prestige scores for the U.S.S.R. were deleted, since too few occupations were available from that country for comparison. Rankings for Germany, and prestige scores for Great Britain, New Zealand, and Japan were transformed to meet rankings of

---

[1] A. Inkles and P.H. Rossi, "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige", in The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXI (July 1955-May,1956), pp. 329-339.

the U.S.A. and Edmonton vicinity-- i.e., the higher the score or rank, the higher the prestige. Only those occupations which could be compared across five out of the six countries were used. Results of this comparison are presented in Table 4.1. Occupations used for comparison, by country, and prestige scores can be viewed in Appendix C of this thesis.

Table 4.1

EDMONTON VICINITY AND INKLES AND ROSSI OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE COMPARISONS

Country	No. of Occupation	r	Significance
U.S.A.			
with Germany	11	.95	.001
with Great Britain	11	.96	.001
with New Zealand	11	.96	.001
with Japan	10	.82	.002
with Edmonton	11	.84	.001
Germany			
with Great Britain	11	.96	.001
with New Zealand	11	.93	.001
with Japan	10	.85	.001
with Edmonton	11	.88	.001
Great Britain			
with New Zealand	11	.99	.001
with Japan	10	.84	.001
with Edmonton	11	.94	.001
New Zealand			
with Japan	10	.80	.002
with Edmonton	11	.90	.001
Japan			
with Edmonton	10	.73	.009

Correlations range from +.73 to +.99, all very high. From this, it is concluded that Edmonton and vicinity youth rank occupations similar to the popular prestige rankings of the Inkles and Rossi Study-- i.e., similar to the popular prestige rankings of the U.S.A., Germany, Great Britain, New Zealand and Japan.

Edmonton Vicinity Rural/Urban Youth's Prestige Rankings and a National Comparison

The prestige rankings of these rural/urban youth are compared over all occupations with those of the 1967 Pineo and Porter study[1] done in Canada. The total list of occupations and prestige scores used for comparison can be seen in Appendix C. One hundred and ninety-six occupations were compared. Only those occupations "Not in the Labor Force" such as "someone who lives off stocks and bonds", "someone who lives on relief", and the non-existent occupations of "archeopotrist" and "biologer" were deleted from the Pineo and Porter list. Rankings were expected to be similar.

A rank order correlation analysis yielded a Spearman correlation coefficient of +.91 at the .001 level of significance. Rankings were expected to be similar and were found to be so. Edmonton and vicinity youth ranked occupations much the same as those on the national level.

Rural/Urban Differences in Perceived Barriers

Research had indicated that rural youth expected to attain high prestige occupations less frequently than urban youth, that they have less knowledge of occupations, that they receive less adequate vocational counselling, and that they employ different desiderata when seeking employment than do urban youth. The objective is to test these findings.

Expectations-- Significant differences between rural and urban occupational expectations were predicted, rurals having lower occupational expectations.

A list of frequencies for rurals and for urbans was obtained in

---

[1] P.C. Pineo and John Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada", in Social Stratification: Canada, ed. by Curtis E. James and W.G. Scott, pp. 64-68.

answer to the question, "what kind of job do you really expect to have most of your life?" The five occupations of highest frequency were chosen for comparison, and can be viewed in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

RURAL/URBAN DIFFERENCES IN OCCUPATIONAL EXPECTATIONS

Sex/Residence/Occupation	Frequency	Occupational Category
Rural		
Public Grade School Teacher	18	Professional
Farmer Owner and Operator	18	Farm
Social Worker	12	Semi-Professional
Stenographer	10	Clerical and Sales
Construction Laborer	10	Unskilled
Urban		
Lawyer	21	Professional
Civil Engineer	15	Professional
Medical/Dental Technician	13	Semi-Professional
Public Grade School Teacher	13	Professional
Physician	13	Professional

Rural youth do, as predicted, appear to have lower occupational expectations than do urban youth, as indicated by the fact that for urban youth five out of five occupations listed came from the top two occupational categories, Professional and Semi-Professional, while only two out of five occupations did so for the rural sample.

Knowledge of Occupations-- Significant differences between rurals and urbans in knowledge of current positions available, understanding of requirements for entry into occupations, and understanding of rewards for occupations were expected. Rurals are expected to have less knowledge in all areas.

Chi-square analysis was used to determine if there were significant differences in the rural and urban distributions and revealed no significant

differences in rural/urban understanding of current positions available at the .05 level of significance. Neither were significant differences found in understanding of rewards for occupations. Chi-square analysis did reveal significant differences in understanding of requirements for entry into occupations. Rural youth perceived themselves to have less knowledge in this area than did urban youth. Rural youth, at least vis-a-vis understanding of requirements for entry, have less knowledge of occupations, which partially supports previous research. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.3. Due to rounding off errors figures will not add to 100 percent all of the time.

Table 4.3

RURAL/URBAN PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONS

	Rural (Percent)	Urban (Percent)
*Degree of knowledge of current positions		
80 - 100%	5.7	7.0
60 - 80%	29.3	27.0
40 - 60%	33.7	38.3
20 - 40%	22.8	14.8
0 - 20%	8.5	12.9
**Degree of knowledge of requirements for entry.		
80 - 100%	2.4	9.8
60 - 80%	22.4	25.5
40 - 60%	37.0	33.3
20 - 40%	24.8	20.8
0 - 20%	13.4	10.6
***Degree of knowledge of rewards		
80 - 100%	6.5	11.8
60 - 80%	34.1	32.9
40 - 60%	29.7	29.0
20 - 40%	20.7	18.8
0 - 20%	8.9	7.5

* -Chi-Square = 7.724; df = 4; Significance = 0.10; ** - Chi-Square = 13.687; df = 4; Significance = 0.01; *** -Chi-Square = 4.417; df = 4; Significance = 0.35.

Perceived Adequacy of Counselling-- Significant differences were predicted between rurals and urbans in relation to perceived adequacy of vocational counselling, with rurals seeing themselves as having less adequate counselling.

Chi-square analysis, presented in Table 4.4, shows significant differences in perceived adequacy of vocational counselling. As previous research has found, rural youth have less adequate vocational counselling than do urban youth.

Table 4.4

RURAL/URBAN PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING

	Rural (Percent)	Urban (Percent)
* Degree of Adequacy of Vocational Counselling		
80 - 100%	2.9	5.4
60 - 80%	23.0	28.6
40 - 60%	33.5	38.2
20 - 40%	19.8	19.5
0 - 20%	21.0	8.3

*-Chi-Square = 17.389; df = 4; Significance = 0.001.

The sample was asked to list the five occupations which they felt they had least understanding of with very least knowledge at the top. For the sample as a whole (rural and urban together), the list was whistle punk; mucking machine operator; troller; draughtsman and archeopotrist (tied); and timber cruiser. The majority of these least-known occupations are regional-- i.e., specific to the logging, mining, and fishing industries (whistle punk, timber cruiser, mucking machine operator, and troller). That "draughtsman" was chosen could well be due to unfamiliarity with the British spelling form used rather than lack of knowledge of the occupation

itself. "Archeopotrist", as noted elsewhere, is a non-existent occupation. It, along with "biologer", and inserted in the occupational list to determine whether respondents were taking the questionnaire seriously. If a good percentage of respondents refused to rate those occupations, as indicated by checking the "I don't know" category, then the questionnaire was being taken earnestly. Fifty percent of the total sample made the said response in prestige ratings, and fifty-one percent in the difficulty ratings vis-a-vis "archeopotrist". The percentages were 27.5 and 25.5 respectively for "biologer". This probably had more to do with confusion with the real occupation of "biologist" rather than with guessing. Rural youth gave "I don't know" responses to "archeopotrist" 50.2 and 47.8 percent for prestige and difficulty respectively; 30.8 and 26.7 percent respectively for "biologer". Urbanites gave the response 49.8 and 54.1 percent for "archeopotrist"; 24.3 and 24.3 percent respectively for "biologer". Thus the questionnaire was considered to be taken in earnest. In future analysis, the two non-existent occupations will be deleted from the list of least known occupations, and the next most frequent different choices cited.

The five least known occupations for rurals were: whistle punk; mucking machine operator; troller, draughtsman; and timber cruiser. For urbans the list was whistle punk; mucking machine operator; troller; draughtsman; and timber cruiser and loom operator (tied).

For both the total sample and rural and urban groups separately, the least-known about occupations are regional and industry specific. This probably indicates that knowledge of occupations tends to be broad, and lessens as the scope becomes more specific.

Differences in Desiderata-- Rural and urban youth were expected to employ different desiderata when seeking an occupation with rural youth more often emphasizing direct economic consideration while urbanites significantly more often emphasize goals congenial to individual interests.

Respondents were asked to rate eleven factors considered desirable or essential when seeking a career on a scale of one to five from "very important" to "not important". Mean scores were obtained for each and the factors were then ranked as indicated in Table 4.5. Rank order correlation coefficients were obtained for those rankings.

Table 4.5

RURAL/URBAN DESIDERATA RANKINGS

Residence	Mean	Ranking
RURAL		
Leadership	2.648	3
Interesting Experience	1.178	11
Esteem	2.381	4
Power	2.854	2
Security	1.733	8
Self-Expression	1.571	9
Profit	2.040	6
Fame	3.219	1
Social Service	1.915	7
Independence	2.235	5
Personal Growth	1.151	10
URBAN		
Leadership	2.266	3
Interesting Experience	1.147	11
Esteem	2.046	5
Power	2.475	2
Security	1.687	8
Self-Expression	1.336	10
Profit	1.876	7
Fame	2.869	1
Social Service	1.907	6
Independence	2.127	4
Personal Growth	1.521	9

[1] Factors one through nine are taken from Richard L. Centers; Psychology of Social Classes, Princeton University Press, U.S.A., 1941, pp. 151-152.

The Spearman correlation coefficient for rank orderings of desiderata factors for rural and urbans was +.97 at the .001 level of significance. The factors then were ranked much the same. The hypothesis that rural youth would emphasize economic factors (security and profit) while urbanites would emphasize factors congenial to individual interests is not supported. Security ranks eighth in importance for rurals and urbans both and profit ranks sixth and seventh for rurals and urbans respectively. Of greatest importance to both groups is fame, power, and leadership. This finding no doubt reflects the fact that this sample is one of adolescents who are at this point in their lives concerned with a struggle for identity. These terms, "power", "fame", and "a job where you could be leader", reflect the need for recognition and autonomy. Esteem and independence are also of moderate importance, esteem ranked fourth in importance for rurals and fifth for urbans, independence ranked fourth for urbans and fifth for rurals. Here too, the struggle for identity and autonomy is reflected.

Sex Differences

Sex Differences in Prestige Rankings-- No significant differences in prestige rankings were predicted between male and female rankings in general, nor when sex was linked with the rural/urban variable.

Rank order correlations were obtained comparing prestige scores by occupational category, and over all occupations for males and females in total as well as for all combinations of male/female and rural/urban.

By occupational category (Professional, Semi-Professional) comparing male with female prestige rankings overall, the Spearman correlation coefficient was 0.98 at the .001 level of significance. Female urban and female rural correlated at 1.0 at the .001 level of significance which is the level of significance for all cases of comparison. Male urbans and male rurals correlated at .98, female urban and male rural at .98, female

rural and male urban at 1.0, male urban and female urban at 1.0, and male rural and female rural at .98. In all cases of comparison, correlations were very high, indicating that males and females overall, and males and females when linked with the residence variable, rank occupations much the same, by occupational category. A summary of these correlations can be seen in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6

MALE/FEMALE AND RURAL/URBAN CORRELATIONS
BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY

Comparison	Spearman Correlation Coefficient	N	Level of Significance
Total Male and Total Female	.98	9	.001
Female Urban and Female Rural	1.0	9	.001
Male Urban and Male Rural	.98	9	.001
Female Urban and Male Rural	.98	9	.001
Female Rural and Male Urban	1.0	9	.001
Male Urban and Female Urban	1.0	9	.001
Male Rural and Female Rural	.98	9	.001

A scattergram over all occupations comparing total male and female prestige rankings yielded a positive correlation of .97 with an r^2 of .94 at the 0.00001 level of significance.

Rank-order correlations by sex and residence were obtained over all occupations and are presented in Table 4.7. All correlations were very high indicating that males and females over all, and males and females when linked with the residence variable, rank occupations similarly in terms of prestige. The hypothesis that males and females whether rural or urban would rank occupations similarly is therefore supported.

Table 4.7

RANK-ORDER CORRELATIONS OVER ALL OCCUPATIONS
BY SEX AND RESIDENCE

Comparison Group Group	Spearman Correlation Coefficients	N	Level of Significance
Total Male and Total Female	.96	203	.001
Female Urban and Female Rural	.97	203	.001
Male Urban and Male Rural	.97	203	.001
Female Urban and Male Rural	.92	203	.001
Female Rural and Male Urban	.95	203	.001
Male Urgan and Female Urban	.96	203	.001
Male Rural and Female Rural	.94	203	.001

T-Tests were conducted for each individual occupation in order to determine significance differences in prestige scores for males and females in total, and for all combinations of male/female and rural/urban. Significance in differences in means was determined in the same manner as for t-tests, rural and urban. Listings of these significant differences can be found in Appendix B of this thesis.

Females overall tended to ascribe greater prestige to those occupations which are traditionally female (for example, typist, file clerk, air hostess and receptionist), to those which they would have good accessibility (for example, clerk in an office, accountant, professionally trained librarian, social worker and bookkeeper), to those in the arts (for example, architect, sculptor, and ballet dancer), and to those occupations in the helping, caring, teaching, and protective realms (psychologist, physician, minister, priest, public grade school teacher, university professor, policeman, lawyer, and county court judge). Males overall rated few occupations higher than females. Those they did rate higher tended to be

in the unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled categories, jobs lower in the occupational hierarchy, but which would provide a good income or a measure of independence (loggers, trailer truck drivers, automobile repairmen, or funeral directors, etc.).

Rural females tended to rate higher than urban females those occupations in clerical and sales (air hostess, typists, and office clerks), jobs which they themselves would have good access to. In addition, these females tended to rate higher those occupations which are traditionally male and which occupy postions lower in the prestige hierarchy-- occupations from the small proprietors managers and officials category (foreman in a factory and superintendent of a construction job), from skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled categories (welders, power crane operators, steamroller operators, automobile workers, aircraft workers, and taxicab drivers). Farming occupations were also rated higher by rural than urban females. These male occupations in the semi-skilled, skilled, and unskilled categories may be rated higher by rural females because they represent those occupations which may be most accessible to their future husbands-- rural males. Urban females rated only two occupations higher than did rural females, that of "airplane mechanic", and "bookbinder".

Rural males tended to rate higher than did urban males those occupations from farming, skilled, unskilled, and semi-skilled categories, those occupations capable of generating an adequate income, and which require a moderate amount of post-secondary education. Examples of such occupations are: bricklayers, power linemen, machinists, sheet metal workers, textile mill workers, oilfield workers, carpenter's helpers, and construction labourers. Urban males rated only three occupations significantly higher than did rural males, musician in a symphony orchestra, advertising

executive and author. This perhaps reflects city living-- a greater emphasis on the arts and on consumer buying.

Female urbans tended to give higher ratings than did male urbans to occupations from the professional and semi-professional categories, not only to traditionally female or artistic occupations such as registered nurse, playground director, ballet dancer or musicians in a symphony orchestra, but to mixed sex occupations such as physicist, mathematician, biologist, psychologist, physician, economist, and high school teacher. This could reflect a feeling of greater accessibility to the professional and semi-professional occupations by urban females as well as a greater emphasis on higher education. Again rural males rated higher occupations from the farming, small proprietors, managers, and officials; skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled categories. As with males compared with females overall, rural males rated higher the traditionally female occupations of "waitress in a restaurant" and "laundress", perhaps reflecting the impending need of these young men about to move into the working world or away from home to find replacements for functions mother traditionally filled (feeding and clothing).

The majority of occupations rated higher by rural females than by male urbanites were traditionally male occupations from small proprietors, managers and officials; farming; skilled; and semi-skilled categories. Rural females also tended to accord greater prestige to female occupations in the clerical, skilled, and semi-skilled categories-- tellers, typists, custom seamstresses, professional babysitting, etc. As well, these same females valued over fifty percent (twelve out of twenty-one) of the professional occupations higher than urban males. This perhaps reflects the greater import of higher education for these young women. Only three occupations were rated higher by urban males: waitress in a restaurant, T.V.

star, and saw sharpener.

Urban males granted significantly more prestige than did their female counterparts to only three occupations: sawmill operator, automobile repairman and saw sharpener. Urban females rated higher female occupations in the clerical category such as clerk in an office, stenographer and I.B.M. keypunch operator. They also valued more highly a large percentage of professional and semi-professional occupations, thirteen out of twenty-one and ten out of twenty-nine respectively, than did their male counterparts. This again probably reflects a greater emphasis on the importance of higher education to the urban female as compared to urban males for her own career and those of her prospective mates.

Like urban females, rural females granted greater prestige to occupations from the professional and semi-professional categories, sixteen out of twenty-one and fourteen out of twenty-nine respectively, than did rural males. The males rated eighteen occupations higher than rural females. Of these, fourteen were from skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled categories.

Sex Differences in Expectations-- It was hypothesized that rurals, both males and females, tend to have lower occupational expectations than do both sexes in the urban area.

A list of frequencies by sex and residence was obtained in answer to the question, "What kind of job do you really expect to have most of your life?" The five occupations of highest frequency were chosen for comparison and can be seen in Table 4.8.

Females appear to have greater occupational expectations than do males overall, with three out of five most frequently listed occupations falling in the top two categories for females, as compared to two out of

Table 4.8

SEX DIFFERENCES IN OCCUPATIONAL EXPECTATIONS

Sex/Residence/Occupation	Frequency	Occupational Category
MALE		
Civil Engineer	20	Professional
Farmer Owner and Operator	16	Farm
Lawyer	14	Professional
Electrician	12	Skilled
Construction Laborer	11	Unskilled
FEMALE		
Public Grade School Teacher	24	Professional
Medical/Dental Technician	22	Semi-Professional
Housekeeper in Private Home	12	Unskilled
Social Worker	12	Semi-Professional
Stenographer	12	Clerical and Sales
MALE RURAL		
Farmer Owner and Operator	16	Farm
Construction Laborer	9	Unskilled
Electrician	6	Skilled
Automobile Repairman	5	Semi-Skilled
Veterinarian	5	Professional
MALE URBAN		
Civil Engineer	15	Professional
Lawyer	14	Professional
Accountant	9	Professional
Physician	8	Professional
Electrician	6	Skilled
FEMALE RURAL		
Public Grade School Teacher	14	Professional
Social Worker	11	Semi-Professional
Stenographer	10	Clerical and Sales
Typist	7	Clerical and Sales
Medical/Dental Technician	7	Semi-Professional
FEMALE URBAN		
Medical/Dental Technician	11	Semi-Professional
Public Grade School Teacher	10	Professional
Lawyer	7	Professional
Housekeeper in a Private Home	6	Unskilled
Physician	5	Professional

five for males. Urban females have higher expectations than rural females and urban males have higher expectations than rural males. Urban females have greater expectations than do rural males, and rural females less than urban males. Urban males and females stand about equal, while rural females have greater expectations than do rural males.

The hypothesis that rurals both male and female, tend to have lower occupational expectations than do both sexes of the urban sample is supported.

Sex Differences in Knowledge of Occupations-- Both males and females of the rural sample were expected to have less knowledge of current positions available, less understanding of requirements for entry into occupations, and less understanding of rewards for occupations than do both sexes in the urban sample.

Chi-square analysis was used to determine significant differences in the rural/urban, male/female distributions at the .05 level of significance. Results of this analysis are presented in Tables 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15.

Significant differences in all areas of knowledge of occupations (requirements for entry, rewards, and job availability) were found when comparing males and females overall, with males having more knowledge in all areas. No significant differences were found between rural and urban females. Urban males had more knowledge of requirements for entry than did rural males. Rural males had greater knowledge of current positions available than did urban females. Urban males had a greater perceived knowledge of requirements for entry and rewards than did rural females and more knowledge of rewards than urban females. Rural males had a better understanding of requirements for entry and rewards than did rural females.

Rural males, then, lack knowledge of requirements for entry into

Table 4.9

MALE/FEMALE PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONS

	Male (Percent)	Female (Percent)
* Degree of knowledge of current positions		
80 - 100%	7.5	5.1
60 - 80%	33.3	22.1
40 - 60%	33.3	39.6
20 - 40%	17.2	20.4
0 - 20%	9.0	12.8
** Degree of knowledge of requirements for entry		
80 - 100%	8.6	3.4
60 - 80%	30.3	16.7
40 - 60%	31.5	39.3
20 - 40%	20.2	25.6
0 - 20%	9.4	15.0
*** Degree of knowledge of rewards		
80 - 100%	12.3	5.6
60 - 80%	39.9	26.2
40 - 60%	23.1	36.5
20 - 40%	18.3	21.5
0 - 20%	6.3	10.3

* -Chi-Square = 10.559; df = 4; Significance = 0.0320.

** -Chi-Square = 22.226; df = 4; Significance = 0.0002.

*** -Chi-Square = 23.765; df = 4; Significance = 0.0001.

Table 4.10

FEMALE URBAN/FEMALE RURAL PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONS

	Female Urban Percent	Female Rural Percent
* Degree of knowledge of current positions		
80 - 100%	7.3	3.2
60 - 80%	20.2	23.8
40 - 60%	42.2	37.3
20 - 40%	13.8	26.2
0 - 20%	16.5	9.5
** Degree of knowledge of requirements for entry		
80 - 100%	4.6	2.4
60 - 80%	21.3	12.7
40 - 60%	37.0	41.3
20 - 40%	25.0	26.2
0 - 20%	12.0	17.5
*** Degree of knowledge of rewards		
80 - 100%	6.5	4.8
60 - 80%	25.2	27.0
40 - 60%	35.5	37.3
20 - 40%	23.4	19.8
0 - 20%	9.3	11.1

* -Chi-Square = 9.343; df = 4; Significance = 0.053.

** -Chi-Square = 4.880; df = 4; Significance = 0.2998.

*** -Chi-Square = 0.956; df = 4; Significance = 0.9163.

Table 4.11

MALE URBAN/MALE RURAL PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONS

	Male Urban Percent	Male Rural Percent
* Degree of knowledge of current positions		
80 - 100%	6.8	8.3
60 - 80%	32.0	35.0
40 - 60%	35.4	30.0
20 - 40%	15.6	19.2
0 - 20%	10.2	7.5
** Degree of knowledge of requirements for entry		
80 - 100%	13.6	2.5
60 - 80%	28.6	32.5
40 - 60%	30.6	32.5
20 - 40%	17.7	23.3
0 - 20%	9.5	9.2
*** Degree of knowledge of rewards		
80 - 100%	15.5	8.3
60 - 80%	38.5	41.7
40 - 60%	24.3	21.7
20 - 40%	15.5	21.7
0 - 20%	6.1	6.7

* -Chi-Square = 1.979; df = 4; Significance = 0.7395.

** - Chi-Square = 10.920; df = 4; Significance = 0.0275.

*** -Chi-Square = 4.558; df = 4; Significance = 0.3356.

Table 4.12

FEMALE URBAN/MALE RURAL PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONS

	Female Urban Percent	Male Rural Percent
* Degree of knowledge of current positions		
80 - 100%	7.3	8.3
60 - 80%	20.2	35.0
40 - 60%	42.2	30.0
20 - 40%	13.8	19.2
0 - 20%	16.5	7.5
** Degree of knowledge of requirements for entry		
80 - 100%	4.6	2.5
60 -	21.3	32.5
40 - 60%	37.0	32.5
20 - 40%	25.0	23.2
0 - 20%	12.0	9.2
*** Degree of knowledge of rewards		
80 - 100%	6.5	8.3
60 - 80%	25.2	41.7
40 - 60%	35.5	21.7
20 - 40%	23.4	21.7
0 - 20%	9.3	6.7

* -Chi-Square = 11.874; df = 4; Significance = 0.0183.

** -Chi-Square = 4.206; df = 4; Significance = 0.3788.

*** -Chi-Square = 9.176; df = 4; Significance = 0.0568.

Table 4.13

FEMALE RURAL/MALE URBAN PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONS

	Female Rural Percent	Male Urban Percent
* Degree of knowledge of current positions		
80 - 100%	3.2	6.8
60 - 80%	23.8	32.0
40 - 60%	37.3	35.4
20 - 40%	26.2	15.6
0 - 20%	9.5	10.2
** Degree of knowledge of requirements for entry		
80 - 100%	2.4	13.6
60 - 80%	12.7	28.6
40 - 60%	41.3	30.6
20 - 40%	26.2	17.7
0 - 20%	17.5	9.5
*** Degree of knowledge of rewards		
80 - 100%	4.8	15.5
60 - 80%	27.0	38.5
40 - 60%	37.3	24.3
20 - 40%	19.8	15.5
0 - 20%	11.1	6.1

* -Chi-Square = 7.123; df = 4; Significance = 0.1295.

** -Chi-Square = 25.871; df = 4; Significance = 0.0000.

*** -Chi-Square = 16.748; df = 4; Significance = 0.0022.

Table 4.14

MALE URBAN/FEMALE URBAN PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONS

	Male Urban Percent	Female Urban Percent
* Degree of knowledge of current positions		
80 - 100%	6.8	7.3
60 - 80%	32.0	20.2
40 - 60%	35.4	42.2
20 - 40%	15.6	13.8
0 - 20%	10.2	16.5
** Degree of knowledge of requirements for entry		
80 - 100%	13.6	4.6
60 - 80%	28.6	21.3
40 - 60%	30.6	37.0
20 - 40%	17.7	25.0
0 - 20%	9.5	12.0
*** Degree of knowledge of rewards		
80 - 100%	15.5	6.5
60 - 80%	38.5	25.2
40 - 60%	24.3	35.5
20 - 40%	15.5	23.4
0 - 20%	6.1	9.3

* -Chi-Square = 6.098; df = 4; Significance = 0.1919.

** -Chi-Square = 9.153; df = 4; Significance = 0.0574.

*** -Chi-Square =13.186; df = 4; Significance = 0.0104.

Table 4.15

MALE RURAL/FEMALE RURAL PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE OF OCCUPATIONS

	Male Rural Percent	Female Rural Percent
* Degree of knowledge of current positons		
80 - 100%	8.3	3.2
60 - 80%	35.0	23.8
40 - 60%	30.0	37.3
20 - 40%	19.2	26.2
0 - 20%	7.5	9.5
** Degree of knowledge of requirements for entry		
80 - 100%	2.5	2.4
60 - 80%	32.5	12.7
40 - 60%	32.5	41.3
20 - 40%	23.3	26.2
0 - 20%	9.2	17.5
*** Degree of knowledge of rewards		
80 - 100%	8.3	4.8
60 - 80%	41.7	27.0
40 - 60%	21.7	37.3
20 -- 40%	21.7	19.8
0 - 20%	6.7	11.1

* -Chi-Square = 8.102; df = 4; Significance = 0.0879.

** -Chi-Square = 15.414; df = 4; Significance = 0.0039.

*** -Chi-Square = 11.605; df = 4; Significance = 0.0205.

occupations. Urban females lack information on current positions available and rewards, and rural females lack knowledge of requirements for entry into occupations. Urban females lack information on current positions available and rewards, and rural females lack knowledge of requirements for entry and rewards.

Males have more knowledge of occupations overall. The most knowledgeable are urban males, followed by rural males. Urban and rural females each lack in two areas. The hypothesis that rurals, whether male or female, have less knowledge of occupations than do urbans is only partially supported, for urban females also lack knowledge of occupations, even more so than rural males.

Perceived Adequacy of Counseling-- It was hypothesized that both males and females of the rural sample would see themselves as having less adequate vocational counseling, as provided by their schools, than would both sexes in the urban sample.

Chi-square analysis was again used to determine significant differences in male/female and rural/urban combination distributions at the .05 level of significance. Results are presented in Tables 4.16 through to 4.22.

No significant differences were found between males and females overall. Nor were significant differences found between rural and urban males, female urbans and male rurals, male and female urbans, or male and female rurals.

The only significant difference found in perceived adequacy of vocational counseling was that both male and female urbanites thought their vocational counseling to be more adeuqate than rural females.

The hypothesis was only partially supported. Only female rurals

Table 4.16

MALE/FEMALE PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING

	Male (Percent)	Female (Percent)
* Degree of Adequacy of Vocational Counselling		
80 - 100%	5.1	3.0
60 - 80%	27.2	24.3
40 - 60%	37.0	34.3
20 - 40%	18.9	20.4
0 - 20%	11.8	17.8

* -Chi Square = 4.989; df = 4; Significance = 0.2884.

Table 4.17

FEMALE URBAN/FEMALE RURAL PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING

	Female Urban (Percent)	Female Rural (Percent)
* Degree of Adequacy of Vocational Counselling		
80 - 100%	2.9	3.2
60 - 80%	28.8	20.6
40 - 60%	42.3	27.8
20 - 40%	18.3	22.2
0 - 20%	7.7	26.2

* -Chi Square = 16.467; df = 4; Signifiance = 0.0025.

Table 4.18

MALE URBAN/MALE RURAL PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING

	Male Urban (Percent)	Male Rural (Percent)
* Degree of Adequacy of Vocational Counselling		
80 - 100%	7.3	2.6
60 - 80%	28.5	25.6
40 - 60%	35.0	39.3
20 - 40%	20.4	17.1
0 - 20%	8.8	15.4

* -Chi Square = 5.981; df = 4; Significance = 0.2005.

Table 4.19

FEMALE/URBAN MALE/RURAL PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING

	Female Urban (Percent)	Male Rural (Percent)
* Degree of Adequacy of Vocational Counselling		
80 - 100%	2.9	2.6
60 - 80%	28.8	25.6
40 - 60%	42.3	39.3
20 - 40%	18.3	17.1
0 - 20%	7.7	15.4

* -Chi Square = 3.162; df = 4; Significance = 0.5310.

Table 4.20

FEMALE RURAL/MALE URBAN PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING

	Female Rural (Percent)	Male Urban (Percent)
* Degree of Adequacy of Vocational Counselling		
80 - 100%	3.2	7.3
60 - 80%	20.6	28.5
40 - 60%	27.8	35.0
20 - 40%	22.2	20.4
0 - 20%	26.2	8.8

* -Chi Square = 16.576; df = 4; Significance = 0.0023.

Table 4.21

MALE URBAN/FEMALE URBAN PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING

	Male Urban (Percent)	Female Urban (Percent)
* Degree of Adequacy of Vocational Counselling		
80 - 100%	7.3	2.9
60 - 60%	28.5	28.8
40 - 60%	35.0	42.3
20 - 40%	20.4	18.3
0 - 20%	8.8	7.7

* -Chi Square = 3.181; df = 4; Significance = 0.5279.

Table 4.22

MALE RURAL/FEMALE RURAL PERCEIVED ADEQUACY OF VOCATIONAL COUNSELLING

	Male Rural (Percent)	Female Rural (Percent)
* Degree of Adequacy of Vocational Counselling		
80 - 100%	2.6	3.2
60 - 80%	25.6	20.6
40 - 60%	39.3	27.8
20 - 40%	17.1	22.2
0 - 20%	15.4	26.2

* -Chi Square = 7.344; df = 4; Significance = 0.1188.

viewed the level of vocational counseling offered in their schools to be less adequate than male and female urbanites.

The total male and total female sample were asked to list the five occupations which they felt they had least understanding of, with very least knowledge at the top of the list. Males had least understanding of whistle punk, mucking machine operator, troller, draughtsman, and timber cruiser. The list was identical for females. Again, as with rurals and urbans overall, occupations least known about are regional and industry specific. That draughtsman was chosen could probably have more to do with unfamilarity with the British spelling used than to lack of knowledge about the occupation itself.

Difference in Desiderata-- It was hypothesized that rural youth, whether male or female, would emphasize economic considerations when seeking an occupation, while urban youth, whether male or female, would emphasize individual interests.

Here, as with rural and urban comparisons, mean scores for desiderata factors were obtained, ranked, and means fed into the computer to obtain rank-order correlations. Tables 4.23, 4.24, and 4.25 show this analysis.

Results parallelled those of the urban-rural comparison. The hypothesis that rurals would emphasize direct economic consideration (security and profit) while urbans would emphasize goals congenial to individual interests was not supported. All groups elected fame, power, and leadership as most important. Also important was independence and esteem. Security was ranked seventh or eighth by all groups, and profit sixth or seventh. This again probably reflects the adolescent struggle for personal identity and autonomy.

Table 4.23

DESIDERATA MEANS*

	Rural	Urban	Male	Female	Male Rural	Male Urban	Female Rural	Female Urban
Leadership	2.648	2.266	2.238	2.696	2.273	2.209	3.008	2.342
Interesting Experience	1.178	1.147	1.216	1.101	1.215	1.216	1.143	1.054
Esteem	2.381	2.046	2.067	2.371	2.124	2.020	2.627	2.081
Power	2.854	2.475	2.368	2.992	2.413	2.331	3.278	2.667
Security	1.733	1.687	1.651	1.776	1.636	1.662	1.825	1.721
Self-Expression	1.571	1.336	1.472	1.426	1.562	1.399	1.579	1.252
Profit	2.040	1.876	1.840	2.089	1.860	1.824	2.214	1.946
Fame	3.219	2.869	2.844	3.262	2.884	2.811	3.540	2.946
Social Services	1.915	1.907	2.149	1.641	2.182	2.122	1.659	1.622
Independence	2.235	2.127	2.134	2.232	2.157	2.115	2.310	2.144
Personal Growth	1.551	1.521	1.617	1.443	1.521	1.696	1.579	1.288

* Factors one through nine were taken from Richard L. Centers. Psychology of Social Classes, Princeton University Press, U.S.A., 1941, pp. 151-152.

Table 4.24

DESIDERATA RANKINGS*

Factor	Rural	Urban	Male	Female	Male Rural	Male Urban	Female Rural	Female Urban
Leadership	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Interesting Experience	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Esteem	4	5	6	4	6	6	4	5
Power	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Security	8	8	8	7	8	9	7	7
Self-Expression	9	10	10	10	9	10	9.5	10
Profit	6	7	7	6	7	7	6	6
Fame	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Social Services	7	6	4	8	4	4	8	8
Independence	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4
Personal Growth	10	9	9	9	10	8	9.5	9

* Factors one through nine were taken from Richard L. Centers, Psychology of Social Classes, Princeton University Press, U.S.A., 1941, pp. 151-152.

Table 4.25

DESIDERATA RANK-ORDER CORRELATIONS BY SEX AND RESIDENCE

Comparison Groups	Spearman Correlation Coefficient	N	Significance
Male with Female	0.97	11	.001
Female Urban with Female Rural	0.90	11	.001
Male Urban with Male Rural	0.99	11	.001
Female Urban with Male Rural	0.90	11	.001
Female Rural with Male Urban	0.87	11	.001
Male Urban with Female Urban	0.89	11	.001
Male Rural with Female Rural	0.90	11	.001

Limitations of the Study

This study has recognized limitations. Firstly, variables other than the ones to be studied, such as level of aspirations, quality of education, and level of skills are largely ignored. More previous research has appeared in those areas, however, than has been done in the area of perceived differences vis-a-vis vocational counseling and knowledge of occupations. Secondly, time and money considerations preclude collecting data from a large sample of respondents, thereby limiting the degree to which findings can be generalized to the population at large.

One of the major weaknesses of the study may be the type of sampling procedure used, creating possible bias and difficulty in generalizability. Although simple random sampling has the advantages of requiring a minimum knowledge of the population in advance and easy analysis of data,[1] the sampling was done on a cluster basis-- i.e., clusters within a 100 mile radius of Edmonton. Pure simple random samplying is more precise due to tendency of people toward homogeneity in a cluster. This, however, is offset by the fact that clustering is more efficient in terms of time and money costs.[2]

In addition to biases arising from the use of cluster sampling, possible bias is introduced through the use of mailed-out questionnaires. Validity depends upon the willingness and ability of respondents to provide information. Differential selection of students to complete question-

---

[1] D.C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, (New York: David McKay Company Inc., 1970), p. 57.

[2] H.W. Smith, Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1975), p. 124.

naires by school authorities introduces bias. Only one known case of such exists in the sample-- the Vice-Principal of Ross Shepherd High School distributed questionnaires to all English majors. Further, problems in external validity are introduced when participation is on a volunteer basis since some types of people are more likely to volunteer than others, so that respondents may not be truly representative of the population at large.[1] Only in one case is the asking for volunteers known, that of Ardrossan. However, in this case at least motivation for all students to participate was high, for those who did were exempted from a math exam. It is suspected that participation on a volunteer basis may have occurred in other schools as well.

Although problems arise through the use of mailed-out questionnaires and cluster sampling, it is felt that advantages to using such techniques outweight the disadvantages. The mailed-out questionnaire itself has the advantage of wide coverage with a minimum expenditure of time and money. It provides for uniform presentation of questions, gives respondents a sense of privacy, and lessens the interviewer effect.[2] Although problems in generalizability arise from the techniques employed, the question can be settled by replicating the study in different areas.

One final problem in completion of the questionnaire which could produce confounding effects if related to motivational level. The questionnaire is a lengthy one, and fatigue or boredome in rating could result in incompletion of patterned responses. With this in mind, all questionnaires

---

[1] Ibid., p. 71.

[2] D.C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Management, p. 57.

exhibiting indications of patterned response were discarded as were questionnaires considered incomplete.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

General findings of the study are as follows:

High correlations between occupational prestige and difficulty of achievement lend strong support to the Davis-Moore Theory of Social Stratification, which states that certain positions in society are functionally more important than others to the functioning of that society. These positions require greater talent, training or skill than others. Functional importance and scarcity of personnel account for the emergence of differentually valued positions in a society-- differential rewards (primarily prestige and income) are attached to these positions to induce fullfillment of them.

Testing the Hodge, Treiman, and Rossi structural-cultural view of prestige yielded inconclusive results. Functionally important positions to any society (health, education, business functions) should be ranked higher by all, inversions in ranking (due to cultural differences) occurring within rather than between categories. Their theory attempts to explain the persistence of similar rankings of occupations across nations. Correlations between rurals and urbans by occupational categories, and by all occupations were high-- the ranking was similar between the two groups. Their rankings, however, differed from national rankings insofar as middle categories were reversed-- large proprietors, managers, and officials were placed ahead rather than behind semi-professionals, and clericals were placed after rather than before semi-skilled occupations. However, those occupations considered important to the functioning of every society (health,

business, and education) were still ranked at the top.

Rural youth overall tend to rate higher those occupations which they would have a reasonable chance of getting-- farming; clerical; small proprietors, managers, and officals; skilled; semi-skilled and unskilled. There was a high correlation between males and females vis-a-vis occupational prestige. Females overall tended to give greater prestige to traditionally female occupations, to those to which they would have good access (accountants, social workers, etc.), to those in the arts, helping, caring, teaching, and protective realms. Males overall rated higher only a few occupations and those were occupations from the skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled categories which would provide a good income or a measure of independence.

Rural females rated higher than urban females clerical jobs to which they would have good access. They also rated traditionally male occupations in the lower categories, higher-- welder, power crane operator, farmers, foremen in factories, etc., occupations which would be most acceptable to their future husbands-- rural males. Rural males rated these same occupations, which provide an adequate income with a moderate amount of post-secondary education, higher than did urban males. Urban females rated professional and semi-professional occupations higher than rural males, perhaps reflecting a greater emphasis on education and a greater feeling of accessibility to occupations in higher prestige categories for these women. Not only did rural females rate the occupations to which they would have better access higher, when compared to urban males, they also rated twelve out of twenty-one professional occupations higher. This too may reflect a greater emphasis on higher education for these women. Urban females also rated many professional and semi-professional occupations higher than did urban males, again reflecting a greater emphasis on higher educa-

tion for these women, both for her own career and for that of her prospective mate -- urban males. Research which has found that occupations that people have the best realistic chance of achieving tend to be elevated is supported by this sample.

The prestige rankings of Edmonton and vicinity rural and urban youth correlated moderately (.61) with the NORC rankings done in the United States. This moderate correlation could be due to the small number of occupations compared (31) or to regional differences which could be lost at the national level.

Edmonton and vicinity correlated highly with prestige rankings of Inkles and Rossi-- i.e., with those of Germany, U.S.A., Great Britain, Japan and New Zealand. This lends support to researchers who have found that occupational rankings tend to be similar across nations.

The prestige rankings of this sample of rural and urban youth correlated at .91 with the Canadian National rankings obtained by Pineo and Porter in 1967. Edmonton vicinity rural and urban youth tend to rate occupations similar to the national sample.

Rural youth, whether male or female, were expected to perceive greater barriers to higher occupational attainment than urban, to have less knowledge of occupations, to have less adequate vocational counselling, to have less occupational expectations, and to emphasize direct economic considerations rather than congeniality to individual interests than urban youth.

This sample of rural youth did appear to have lower occupational expectations than the urbanites. Females overall more frequently expected to have occupations in the professional and semi-professional categories than did males. Urban females had greater expectation than rural females, urban males greater than rural males, urban females greater than rural males, and rural females less than urban males. Urban males and females

were about equal in their expectations, while rural females had greater expectations than rural males.

Knowledge of occupations was divided into three areas-- knowledge of requirements for entry into occupations, knowledge of rewards for occupations, and knowledge of current positions available. Rurals overall felt that they had less knowledge of requirements for entry than did urbanites. Rurals overall felt that they had less knowledge of requirements for entry into jobs than did urbanites. Urban males felt they had adequate knowledge in all three areas of occupations (rewards, requirements for entry, and availability of current positions). Rural males lacked knowledge about current positions available, urban females about current positions and rewards, and rural females of requirements for entry and rewards. The hypothesis that rurals, whether male or female have less knowledge of occupations is partially supported, for urban females also lack knowledge of occupations, even more so than rural males.

Rural youth overall, viewed the level of occupational counseling offered in their schools as less adequate than urbanites. No significant differences were found when sex was linked with residence, excepting in the case of rural females, who saw their vocational counseling as less adequate than did urban males and females. The hypothesis then is only partially supported-- rural males thought their counseling just as adequate as did male or female urbanites. Rural females thought their counseling to be less adequate than urban males or females.

Occupations least known about for rurals and urbans, both male and female, are regional or industry specific, such as whistle punk, mucking machine operator, troller, and timber cruiser.

Researchers such as Centers[1] have indicated that lower class groups often employ desiderata (such as economics and security) which prevent them from moving up in the occupational hierarchy. Contrary to expectations, rural youth, whether male or female, did not emphasize direct economic considerations. Of some eleven factors presented for rating, both urbans and rurals, whether male or female, ranked as most important when seeking a job fame, power, and leadership, with esteem and independence also highly important. Security and profit were consistently ranked low-- sixth, seventh, or eighth. That fame, power, leadership, esteem, and independence were considered important probably reflects the struggle for personal identity and autonomy going on at this time in the adolescent life, and can be taken as evidence neither for nor against the view of researchers such as Centers, and does not indicate that rural youth employ desiderata different from urban youth which would prevent them from attaining higher level occupations.

Implications

Findings of the study are reflected in the following implications: More research is needed to strengthen or weaken the structural-cultural view of prestige posited by Hodge, Treiman, and Rossi. That the sample appeared to invert occupations in the middle categories compared to national studies may be due to cultural differences which are obscured at the level at which those researchers are working, the national level. Further studies need to be done to strengthen or weaken the position taken by these investigators.

---

[1] Richard L. Centers, Psychology of Social Classes, Princeton University Press, U.S.A., 1941, pp. 151-152.

Further research is needed in order to determine whether rural and urban females tend to rate professional and semi-professional occupations higher than rural and urban males due to a greater emphasis on education either for themselves or for their prospective mates.

Further research is needed to determine if the only moderate correlation of Edmonton and vicinity prestige rankings with those of the American NORC study is due to cultural (regional differences) or to the small number of occupations compared.

Rural clearly had less occupational expectations than did urbans. Although rural males saw the level of vocational counseling offered in their schools to be just as adequate as urban males and females, and although these young rural men feel they lack knowledge in only one area, current positions available, they have lower occupational expectations than urban males and females and rural females. Although other factors such as level of parental SES and current program of study could influence level of occupational expectations, it may be well to look at the type and range of vocational counseling offered these young men. Rural females, although they have higher occupational expectations than do rural males, are still behind urban males and females. They feel they lack knowledge of requirements for entry into, and rewards for, occupations and at the same time feel their vocational counseling to be less adequate than urbanites. These young women need more and better occupational counseling. Occupations least known about by both male and female, rural and urban, are regional or industry specific indicating that all groups need more detailed information about specialized occupations.

More research, using adults rather than adolescents in the sample, is needed to strengthen or weaken the position taken by researchers such

as Centers[1] who have found that the working class often employ desiderata such as economics or security which become a barrier to attaining higher level occupations. Their sample consisted of adults. These people, if motivated purely by economic or security factors when seeking a job, would not take the risk involved in moving into an occupation which is uncertain in terms of money and duration, but more congenial to individual interests. The sample in this study was adolescents who appear to be most concerned neither with money, security, nor congeniality to individual interests, but rather to factors associated with personal identity and autonomy.

---

[1] Richard L. Centers, Psychology of Social Classes, Princeton University Press, U.S.A., 1941, pp. 151-152.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blackburn, Donald J; and Patricia L. Storey. "A Crises for Rural Youth", Agrologist Vol. 21 (Jan-Feb 1973).

Blau, Peter M.; and Otis D. Duncan, with the collaboration of Andrea Tyree. The American Occupational Structure. U.S.A.: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1967.

Breton, Raymond; and John C. McDonald. "Occupational Preferences of Canadian High School Students", Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives, Edited by B.R. Blishen; F.E. Jones; K.D. Naugele; and J. Porter. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd. 1971.

Brinkerhoff, Merlin B; and Philip R. Kunz. "Some Notes on the Measurement of Perceived Barriers to Occupational Aspirations", Rural Sociology Vol. 37, No. 3 (Sept 1972), pp. 436-441.

Bultena, Gordon L. "Career Mobility of Low-Income Farm Operators", Rural Sociology Vol. 34, No. 4 (December 1969), pp. 563-568.

Burchinal, Lee G; and P.E. Jacobson. "Migration and Adjustments of Farm and Urban Families and Adolescents in Cedar Rapids, Iowa", Rural Sociology Vol. 28 (December 1963), pp. 365-378.

Campbell, Rex R.; and Susan A. Mulvey. Perceptions of Job Opportunities Among Low Income Groups in Missouri. Columbia: Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Missouri, 1962. pp. 3-9.

Caro, Francis F., and C. Pihlblad. "Aspirations and Expectations-- A Re-Examination of the Biases for Social Class Differences in the Occupational Orientations of Male High School Students", Sociology and Social Research Vol. 49 (1964-1965), pp. 465-573.

Centers, Richard. The Psychology of Social Classes: A Study of Class Consciousness. New York: Russel and Russel, 1961.

Davis, K. "Reply to Tumin". The American Sociological Review, Vol. 18 (August 1953), pp. 59-62.

_____; and W.E. Moore. "The Continuing Debate on Equality-- Some Principles of Stratification", American Sociological Review, Vol. 10, No. 2 (1945), pp. 47-52.

Drabick, Lawrence W. Factors Associated with Expectations: North Dakota High School Seniors. Educational Research Series No. 9, Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State University, 1974. pp. 1-36.

Freedman, Ronald, and Deborah Freedman. "Farm-Reared Elements in the Non-Farm Population", Rural Sociology Vol. 21 (March 1956), pp. 50-61.

Haller, A.O.; L.G. Burchinal; and M.J. Taves. Rural Youth Need Help in Choosing Occupations. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 1963. pp. 1-18.

Hannon, F.D.; and J.A. Beegle. "Evaluations of Occupations by Irish Rural Adolescents on the Basis of Prestige and Difficulty of Achievement", Rural Sociology Vol. 34 (1969). pp. 327-342.

Hatt, Paul K. "Occupations and Social Stratification", American Journal of Sociology Vol. LV (July 1949-May 1950). pp. 533-543.

Hodge, R.W; P.M. Seigel; and P.H. Rossi. "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963", Class, Status, and Power New York: The Free Press, 1966.

odge, W.; D.J. Treiman; and P.H. Rossi. "A Comparative Study of Occupational Prestige", Class, Status and Power Edited by R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset, New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Huaco, George A. "The Functionalist Theory of Stratification: Two Decades of Controversy", Inquiry Vol. 9, No. 1 (Spring 1966). pp. 230-234.

Hyman, Herbert H. "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification", Class, Status, and Power Edited by R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Inkles, A.; and P.H. Rossi. "National Comparison of Occupational Prestige", The American Journal of Sociology Vol. LXI (July 1955-May 1956). pp. 329-339.

Kreutz, Norma B. "The Realizability of Vocational Plans of Grade Twelve Students in Alberta", Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.

Kuvlesky, W.P.; and G.W. Ohlendorf. "A Rural-Urban Comparison of Occupational Status Orientation of Negro Boys", Rural Sociology Vol. 33 (1968). pp. 141-152.

Lipset, S.M. "Social Mobility and Urbanization", Rural Sociology Vol. 20 (Sept-Dec 1955). pp. 220-228.

Lopreato, J.; and L.E. Hazelrigg. Class, Conflict, and Mobility: Theories and Studies of Class Structure. U.S.A.: Chandler Publishing Company, 1972.

Lopreato, J.; and Lionel S. Lewis. "An Analysis of Variables in the Functional Theory of Stratification", The Sociological Quarterly Vol. 4, No. 1 (Winter 1963). pp. 301-311.

Miller, D.C. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. 2nd Edition. New York: David McKay Company Inc., 1970.

Nekolaichuk, Demetro, M. "Student's Vocational Plans: A Three Year Follow-Up Study", Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

North, Cecil; and Paul K. Hatt. " A Popular Evaluation", Sociological Analysis Editied by L. Wilson and L. Kolb. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949.

Pineo, P.C.; and J. Porter. "Occupational Prestige in Canada", Social Stratification: Canada. Edited by E. Curtis and W. Scott. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall of Canada Ltd., 1973.

Reiss, Albert, Jr.; O.D. Duncan; P.K. Hatt; and C.C. North. Occupation and Social Status New York: The Free Press of Glencoe Inc., 1961.

Roberts, Wm. G.; and Ammon O. Ackroyd. "A Study of Post-School Occupations of Students who Graduated From Alberta High Schools in 1949", Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1952.

Simpson, Richard L. "A Modification of the Functional Theory of Stratification", Social Forces Vol. 35 (1957). pp. 132-136.

_____; and Ida Harper Simpson. "Correlates and Estimation of Occupational Prestige", The American Journal of Sociology Vol. LXVI (July 1960 - May 1961). pp. 135-139.

Smith, H.W. Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1975.

Stinchcombe, A.L. "Some Empirical Consequences of the Davis-Moore Theory of Stratification", American Sociological Review Vol. 28 (1963). pp. 805-808.

Taeuber, Karl E. "The Residential Redistribution of Farm-Born Cohorts", Rural Sociology Vol. 32, No. 1 (March 1967). pp. 20-36.

Tumin, Melvin M. "Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis", The American Sociological Review Vol. 18 (August 1953). pp. 53-58.

_____. "Reply to Kingsley Davis", The American Sociological Review Vol. 18 (Dec 1953). pp. 672-673.

Wesolowski, W. "Some Notes on the Functional Theory of Stratification", Class, Status, and Power. Edited by R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND SAMPLE COVERING LETTERS

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

DEPARTMENT OF
[redacted]
PHONE (403) 432-[redacted]
RURAL ECONOMY

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
T6G 2H1

March, 1977

Dear Student:

This survey is an attempt to achieve a better understanding of the problems young people have in choosing their life's career. The information this questionnaire will yield will be of value in developing counselling programs for high school youth. You can help us to improve the lot of students in the future if you will carefully fill out ALL questions, according to direction, on the attached questionnaire. Each individual questionnaire will be held in strictest confidence - you will not put your name on the questionnaire. Information regarding findings of the survey will be sent to your school - in that way you can see how your participation has helped us. Thank you for your co-operation.

Sincerely yours,

D.G. Murri

Encl.

Part I

Your AGE_____

Your SEX (Please CHECK one)

Male_____

Female_____

The NAME OF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL _____ (Please Print)

The NUMBER OF YEARS YOU HAVE BEEN IN HIGH SCHOOL is _____.

Your PROGRAM OF STUDY IS (Please CHECK one)

Matriculation_____

Diploma (general) _____

Diploma (business) _____

Vocational _____

I LIVE: (Please CHECK one)

On a farm _____

In the open country but not on a farm _____

In a village over 1,000 but under 2,500 people _____

In a town of 2,500 to 10,000 people_____

In a city over 10,000 people _____

MY FATHER'S MAIN OCCUPATION is _____ (or was if dead or retired).
(Specify the kind of work he does and not where he works).

IF FATHER IS A FARMER (please CHECK one)

My father is: Owner_____ Renter_____Labourer_____

The number of acres my father operates is_____.

THE AMOUNT OF EDUCATION BY FATHER HAS/HAD is (Please CHECK one)

Some University or College_____

High School _____

Some High School _____

Less than Grade Eight _____

THE AMOUNT OF EDUCATION BY MOTHER HAS/HAD is (Please CHECK one)

Some University of College _____

High School _____

Some High School _____

Less than Grade Eight _____

PARTS II AND III

This part of the questionnaire concerns YOUR OWN PERSONAL VIEW of Occupations. This is a very important part of the questionnaire, so please follow directions carefully, and please do not leave anything out.

A. For each occupation listed, please pick out the statement which BEST describes YOUR OWN PERSONAL OPINION OF THE SOCIAL STANDING that such an occupation has. CIRCLE the appropriate response.

	Excellent Standing	Good Standing	Average Standing	Below Average Standing	Poor Standing	Don't Know Standing
Housekeeper in Private Home	1	2	3	4	5	6
YMCA Director	1	2	3	4	5	6
Typist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Clerk in an Office	1	2	3	4	5	6
Paper-Making Machine Tender	1	2	3	4	5	6
Commercial Farmer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Provincial Premier	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mine Safety Analyst	1	2	3	4	5	6
House Painter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Someone Who Lives Off Property Holdings	1	2	3	4	5	6
Medical or Dental Technician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Waitress in a Restaurant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mailman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bank Teller	1	2	3	4	5	6
Owner of a Manufacturing Plant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Warehouse Hand	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cook in a Restaurant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Elevator Operator in a Building	1	2	3	4	5	6
Travelling Salesman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mayor of a Large City	1	2	3	4	5	6
Manager of a Real Estate Office	1	2	3	4	5	6
Archaeopotrist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Disc Jockey	1	2	3	4	5	6
Superintendent of a Construction Job	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sewing Machine Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Merchandise Buyer for a Department Store	1	2	3	4	5	6
Stenographer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bank Manager	1	2	3	4	5	6
Physicist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Research Technician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Power Lineman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Steam Boiler Fireman	1	2	3	4	5	6
T.V. Announcer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Coal Miner	1	2	3	4	5	6
Worker in a Dry Cleaning or Laundry Plant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Registered Nurse	1	2	3	4	5	6
Architect	1	2	3	4	5	6
Telephone Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mucking Machine Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Biologist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Worker in a Meat Packing Plant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professionally Trained Librarian	1	2	3	4	5	6
General Manager of a Manufacturing Plant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fruit Packer in a Cannery	1	2	3	4	5	6
Member of Canadian Cabinet	1	2	3	4	5	6
Public Grade School Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6
Troller	1	2	3	4	5	6
Travel Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6
Playground Director	1	2	3	4	5	6
Public Relations Man	1	2	3	4	5	6
Custom Seamstress	1	2	3	4	5	6
Airplane Mechanic	1	2	3	4	5	6
Insurance Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6
Plumber	1	2	3	4	5	6
Manager of a Supermarket	1	2	3	4	5	6
Filling Station Attendant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mining Engineer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Aircraft Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cod Fisherman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Insurance Claims Investigator	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Excellent Standing	Good Standing	Average Standing	Below Average Standing	Poor Standing	Don't Know Standing
Foreman in a Factory	1	2	3	4	5	6
Long Shoreman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Textile Mill Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Government Purchasing Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6
Shipping Clerk	1	2	3	4	5	6
Logger	1	2	3	4	5	6
Druggist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bus Driver	1	2	3	4	5	6
Construction Foreman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sawmill Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Automobile Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mathematician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Used Car Salesman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Barber	1	2	3	4	5	6
Welder	1	2	3	4	5	6
Locomotive Engineer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Jazz Musician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Draughtsman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Airline Pilot	1	2	3	4	5	6
Truck Dispatcher	1	2	3	4	5	6
Construction Labourer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professionally Trained Forester	1	2	3	4	5	6
Firefighter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Surveyor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Journalist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Farmer Owner and Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Accountant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Museum Attendant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Air Hostess	1	2	3	4	5	6
Owner of a Food Store	1	2	3	4	5	6
Livestock Buyer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Colonel in the Army	1	2	3	4	5	6
Janitor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Protestant Minister	1	2	3	4	5	6
Wholesale Distributor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Psychologist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Motel Owner	1	2	3	4	5	6
Railroad Conductor	1	2	3	4	5	6
T.V. Star	1	2	3	4	5	6
Department Head in City Government	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bricklayer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Service Station Manager	1	2	3	4	5	6
Laundress	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sculptor	1	2	3	4	5	6
University Professor	1	2	3	4	5	6
File Clerk	1	2	3	4	5	6
Loom Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Stockroom Attendant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Chemist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ballet Dancer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Farm Labourer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Lawyer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Musician in a Symphony Orchestra	1	2	3	4	5	6
Physician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Lunchroom Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Railroad Brakeman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Chiropractor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Someone Who Lives Off Inherited Wealth	1	2	3	4	5	6
Member of a City Council	1	2	3	4	5	6
Member of a Canadian Senate	1	2	3	4	5	6
T.V. Repairman	1	2	3	4	5	6
I.B.M. Keypunch Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Telephone Solicitor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pig Farmer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Manufacturer's Representative	1	2	3	4	5	6
Member of Canadian House of Commons	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Excellent Standing	Good Standing	Average Standing	Below Average Standing	Poor Standing	Don't Know Standing
Biologer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Advertising Executive	1	2	3	4	5	6
Economist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Commercial Artist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Trailer Truck Driver	1	2	3	4	5	6
Author	1	2	3	4	5	6
Social Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Real Estate Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bill Collector	1	2	3	4	5	6
Railroad Section Hand	1	2	3	4	5	6
Dairy Farmer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bookkeeper	1	2	3	4	5	6
Computer Programer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Carpenter's Helper	1	2	3	4	5	6
Beauty Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Garbage Collector	1	2	3	4	5	6
Automobile Repairman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Physiotherapist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	1	2	3	4	5	6
Apprentice to a Master Craftsman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Oiler in a Ship	1	2	3	4	5	6
Typesetter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Funeral Director	1	2	3	4	5	6
Production Worker in the Electronics Industry	1	2	3	4	5	6
T.V. Cameraman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cashier in a Supermarket	1	2	3	4	5	6
Driving Instructor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Policeman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professional Babysitter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Someone Who Lives off Stocks and Bonds	1	2	3	4	5	6
Taxicab Driver	1	2	3	4	5	6
High School Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6
Musician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Butcher in a Store	1	2	3	4	5	6
Machine Setup Man in a Factory	1	2	3	4	5	6
House Carpenter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Quarry Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Catholic Priest	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bartender	1	2	3	4	5	6
Diamond Driller	1	2	3	4	5	6
Salesclerk in a Store	1	2	3	4	5	6
Steamroller Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Power Crane Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Timber Cruiser	1	2	3	4	5	6
Baker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Railroad Ticket Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6
Hospital Attendant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Post Office Clerk	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ship's Pilot	1	2	3	4	5	6
Trade Union Business Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6
Civil Engineer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fathers' Occupation	1	2	3	4	5	6
T.V. Director	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bookbinder	1	2	3	4	5	6
Newspaper Pressman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Oilfield Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pumphouse Engineer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Part-Time Farmer	1	2	3	4	5	6
County Court Judge	1	2	3	4	5	6
Private in the Army	1	2	3	4	5	6
Whistle Punk	1	2	3	4	5	6
Building Contractor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Veterinarian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Someone Who Lives on Relief	1	2	3	4	5	6
Electrician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professional Athlete	1	2	3	4	5	6
Saw Sharpener	1	2	3	4	5	6
Job Counsellor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Machine Operator in a Factory	1	2	3	4	5	6
Advertising Copy Writer	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Excellent Standing	Good Standing	Average Standing	Below Average Standing	Poor Standing	Don't Know Standing
Newspaper Peddler	1	2	3	4	5	6
Steel Mill Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sheet Metal Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Machinist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Receptionist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Tool and Die Maker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Assembly Line Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6

B. For each occupation listed, please pick out the statement which BEST describes YOUR OWN PERSONAL OPINION OF HOW DIFFICULT THAT OCCUPATION WOULD BE TO ACHIEVE. CIRCLE the appropriate response.

	Extremely Difficult	Very Difficult	Average Difficulty	Mildly Difficult	Not Difficult	Don't Know Difficulty
Housekeeper in Private Home	1	2	3	4	5	6
YMCA Director	1	2	3	4	5	6
Typist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Clerk in an Office	1	2	3	4	5	6
Paper-Making Machine Tender	1	2	3	4	5	6
Commercial Farmer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Provincial Premier	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mine Safety Analyst	1	2	3	4	5	6
House Painter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Someone Who Lives Off Property Holdings	1	2	3	4	5	6
Medical or Dental Technician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Waitress in a Restaurant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mailman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bank Teller	1	2	3	4	5	6
Owner of a Manufacturing Plant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Warehouse Hand	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cook in a Restaurant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Elevator Operator in a Building	1	2	3	4	5	6
Travelling Salesman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mayor of a Large City	1	2	3	4	5	6
Manager of a Real Estate Office	1	2	3	4	5	6
Archaeopotrist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Disc Jockey	1	2	3	4	5	6
Superintendent of a Construction Job	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sewing Machine Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Merchandise Buyer for a Department Store	1	2	3	4	5	6
Stenographer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bank Manager	1	2	3	4	5	6
Physicist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Research Technician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Power Lineman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Steam Boiler Fireman	1	2	3	4	5	6
T.V. Announcer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Coal Miner	1	2	3	4	5	6
Worker in a Dry Cleaning or Laundry Plant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Registered Nurse	1	2	3	4	5	6
Architect	1	2	3	4	5	6
Telephone Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mucking Machine Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6
Biologist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Worker in a Meat Packing Plant	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professionally Trained Librarian	1	2	3	4	5	6
General Manager of a Manufacturing Plant	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Extremely Difficult		Very Difficult		Average Difficulty		Mildly Difficult		Not Difficult		Don't Know Difficulty
Fruit Packer in a Cannery	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Member of a Canadian Cabinet	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Public Grade School Teacher	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Troller	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Travel Agent	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Playground Director	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Public Relations Man	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Custom Seamstress	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Airplane Mechanic	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Insurance Agent	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Plumber	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Manager of a Supermarket	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Filling Station Attendant	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Mining Engineer	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Aircraft Worker	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Cod Fisherman	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Insurance Claims Investigator	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Foreman in a Factory	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Long Shoreman	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Textile Mill Worker	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Government Purchasing Agent	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Shipping Clerk	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Logger	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Druggist	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Bus Driver	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Construction Foreman	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Sawmill Operator	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Automobile Worker	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Mathematician	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Used Car Salesman	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Barber	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Welder	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Locomotive Engineer	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Jazz Musician	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Draughtsman	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Airline Pilot	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Truck Dispatcher	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Construction Labourer	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Professionally Trained Forester	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Firefighter	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Surveyor	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Journalist	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Farmer Owner and Operator	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Accountant	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Museum Attendant	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Air Hostess	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Owner of a Food Store	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Livestock Buyer	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Colonel in the Army	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Janitor	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Protestant Minister	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Wholesale Distributor	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Psychologist	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Motel Owner	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Railroad Conductor	1	2		3		4		5		6	
T.V. Star	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Department Head in City Government	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Bricklayer	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Service Station Manager	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Laundress	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Sculptor	1	2		3		4		5		6	
University Professor	1	2		3		4		5		6	
File Clerk	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Loom Operator	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Stockroom Attendant	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Chemist	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Ballet Dancer	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Farm Labourer	1	2		3		4		5		6	
Lawyer	1	2		3		4		5		6	

	Extremely Difficult	Very Difficult	Average Difficulty	Mildly Difficult	Not Difficult	Don't Know Difficulty
Musician in a Symphony Orchestra	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Physician	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Lunchroom Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Railroad Brakeman	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Chiropractor	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Member of a City Council	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Member of a Canadian Senate	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
T.V. Repairman	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
I.B.M. Keypunch Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Telephone Solicitor	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Pig Farmer	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Manufacturer's Representative	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Member of Canadian House of Commons	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Biologer	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Advertising Executive	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Economist	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Commercial Artist	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Trailer Truck Driver	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Author	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Social Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Real Estate Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Bill Collector	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Railroad Section Hand	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Dairy Farmer	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Bookkeeper	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Computer Programer	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Carpenter's Helper	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Beauty Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Garbage Collector	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Automobile Repairman	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Physiotherapist	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Apprentice to a Master Craftsman	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Oiler in a Ship	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Typesetter	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Funeral Director	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Production Worker in the Electronics Industry	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
T.V. Camerman	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Cashier in a Supermarket	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Driving Instructor	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Policeman	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Professional Babysitter	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Someone Who Lives Off Stocks and Bonds	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Taxicab Driver	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
High School Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Musician	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Butcher in a Store	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Machine Setup Man in a Factory	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
House Carpenter	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Quarry Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Catholic Priest	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Bartender	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Diamond Driller	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Salesclerk in a Store	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Steamroller Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Power Crane Operator	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Timber Cruiser	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Baker	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Railroad Ticket Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Hospital Attendant	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---
Post Office Clerk	1	2	3	4	5	6 ---

	Extremely Difficult	Very Difficult	Average Difficulty	Mildly Difficult	Not Difficult	Don't Know Difficulty
Ship's Pilot	1	2	3	4	5	6
Trade Union Business Agent	1	2	3	4	5	6
Civil Engineer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fathers' Occupation	1	2	3	4	5	6
T.V. Director	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bookbinder	1	2	3	4	5	6
Newspaper Pressman	1	2	3	4	5	6
Oilfield Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pumphouse Engineer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Part-Time Farmer	1	2	3	4	5	6
County Court Judge	1	2	3	4	5	6
Private in the Army	1	2	3	4	5	6
Whistle Punk	1	2	3	4	5	6
Building Contractor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Veterinarian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Someone Who Lives on Relief	1	2	3	4	5	6
Electrician	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professional Athlete	1	2	3	4	5	6
Saw Sharpener	1	2	3	4	5	6
Job Counsellor	1	2	3	4	5	6
Machine Operator in a Factory	1	2	3	4	5	6
Advertising Copy Writer	1	2	3	4	5	6
Newspaper Peddler	1	2	3	4	5	6
Steel Mill Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sheet Metal Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Machinist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Receptionist	1	2	3	4	5	6
Tool and Die Maker	1	2	3	4	5	6
Assembly Line Worker	1	2	3	4	5	6

C. There are a little over 200 occupations listed in the foregoing pages. For WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF THESE OCCUPATIONS do you feel that you have an EXCELLENT OR VERY GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF CURRENT POSITIONS AVAILABLE? (Please CHECK one).

80-100%_____ 60-80%_____ 40-60%_____ 20-40%_____ 0-20%_____

D. For WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF THESE OCCUPATIONS do you feel that you have an EXCELLENT OR VERY GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF REQUIREMENTS FOR ENTRY into those occupations? (Please CHECK one).

80-100%_____ 60-80%_____ 40-60%_____ 20-40%_____ 0-20%_____

E. For WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF THESE OCCUPATIONS do you feel that you have an EXCELLENT OR VERY GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF REWARDS for these occupations? Rewards are things like income, prestige, and working conditions. (Please CHECK one).

80-100%_____ 60-80%_____ 40-60%_____ 20-40%_____ 0-20%_____

F. Please list FIVE occupations which you feel you have the LEAST UNDERSTANDING of. (Take the names of those occupations from the list you worked with before). Please try to write them with the one you have the Very Least knowledge of at the top.

Least Knowledge _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

G. My school provides an amount of occupational (Vocational) counselling which I feel is: (Please CHECK one)

Excellent _____

Good _____

Average _____

Somewhat below Average _____

Poor _____

H. What kind of job do you REALLY EXPECT to have most of your life? (Please specify an occupation if you can. _____

PART IV.

In this part of the questionnaire we are interested in what YOU consider to be important when looking for a career.

A. There are many factors one considers in making a choice of the kinds of jobs one would select. CIRCLE the appropriate response which reflects your opinion on each item.

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important	Not Important
A job where you could be leader	1	2	3	4	5
A very interesting job	1	2	3	4	5
A job where you would be looked upon very highly by your fellow men	1	2	3	4	5
A job where you could be boss	1	2	3	4	5
A job which you were absolutely sure of keeping	1	2	3	4	5
A job where you could express your feelings, ideas, talents, or skill	1	2	3	4	5
A very highly paid job	1	2	3	4	5
A job where you could make a name for yourself or become famous	1	2	3	4	5
A job where you could help other people	1	2	3	4	5
A job where you could work more or less on your own	1	2	3	4	5
A job which provides challenge and opportunity for personal growth development	1	2	3	4	5

We, and your fellow students of the future THANK YOU for making this study possible by having given us your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

SAMPLE LETTER TO SCHOOL AUTHORITIES

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Dear _____

Please consider this to be a formal request for entry into _____ school/s in order to investigate Rural/Urban differences in evaluations of occupations which will potentially serve to yield information considered to be useful in helping to alleviate an important sociological problem-- a problem significant to Rural youth today, i.e., that Rural youth encounter barriers to attaining occupations with high socioeconomic status that many Urban youth do not encounter.

Attached for your information is a statement of the "sociological problem" under investigation as a Master of Science Thesis investigation, as well as a copy of the proposed questionnaire.

It is recognized that results of no study is completely useful unless those participants in such a study can benefit from the knowledge that the study has yielded. In these terms it is considered important for students, teachers, and educators to be informed of the results of the study. Feedback will be presented upon completion of the study.

Trusting that the enclosed will enable you to present permission, and that we may hear from you at your earliest convenience,

I remain,

Yours truly,

_____

_____

SAMPLE LETTER TO SCHOOL AUTHORITIES

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Dear _____

We recently communicated with _____, Superintendant of _____County, requesting permission to have the grade twelve students at _____High School complete a questionnaire concerning occupational perceptions as part of Ms. Joan Turner's Master of Science Thesis. He has suggested that we contact you directly.

Enclosed for your examination, is a copy of the proposed questionnaire, along with a statement of the problem under investigation.

We would like to mail you the required number of questionnaires, and have them returned to us in the same manner. May we have your consent to do so? Results of the study will be sent to you immediately upon completion.

Trusting that the enclosed will enable you to grant permission for the survey, and that we may hear from you at your earliest convenience,

I remain,

Yours truly,

D.G. Murri,
Associate Professor,
Department of Rural Economy

SAMPLE LETTER TO SCHOOL AUTHORITIES

_____
_____

_____
_____
_____

Dear _____

Recent communication with _____, Superintendant of _____ Schools, has informed us that you have kindly granted us your cooperation in having your grade twelve students complete the enclosed questionnaires, which is essential to the Master of Science Thesis of Ms. Joan Turner on occupational perceptions of high school students.

We have enclosed _____ questionnaires, along with sufficient postage for return of them, since we are anxious to obtain our data for analysis at the earliest possible time.

We sincerely thank you for your cooperation. Please be assured that results of the study will be forwarded to you immediately upon completion. Trusting that the enclosed will permit you to assist us at your earliest convenience, and that any inquiries will be directed to us without hesitation, I remain,

Yours truly,

D.G. Murri,
Associate Professor,
Department of Rural Economy

SAMPLE LETTER TO SCHOOL AUTHORITIES

_____
_____

_____
_____
_____

Dear _____

In accordance with our telephone conversation of _____ please find enclosed _____ questionnaires contributing to the Master of Science Thesis of Ms. Joan Turner, which you have kindly granted us your cooperation in having your grade twelve students complete. We have enclosed sufficient postage for return of the questionnaires, as we wish to process our data at the earliest possible time.

We sincerely thank you for your cooperation. Please be assured that a copy of research findings will be sent to you upon completion of the study.

Yours truly,

D.G. Murri,
Associate Professor,
Department of Rural Economy

APPENDIX B

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PRESTIGE RANKINGS

APPENDIX B

Table B.1

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN RURAL-URBAN PRESTIGE RANKINGS BY OCCUPATION

Occupation	Rural Mean	Urban Mean	Occupational Classification
YMCA Director	3.238	2.843	Semi-Professional
Typist	2.995	2.767	Clerical and Sales
Clerk in an Office	2.946	2.686	Clerical and Sales
Paper Making Machine Tender	2.295	2.058	Semi-Skilled
Commercial Farmer	3.610	3.297	Farmer
Mine Safety Analyst	3.534	3.298	Professional
Bank Teller	3.293	3.085	Clerical and Sales
Disc Jockey	3.382	3.111	Semi-Professional
Superintendent, Construction	3.699	3.414	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Power Lineman	2.945	2.786	Skilled
Telephone Operator	2.808	2.633	Clerical and Sales
Mucking Machine Operator	2.342	2.040	Skilled
Worker in a Meat Packing Plant	2.430	2.264	Semi-Skilled
Troller	2.411	2.426	Semi-Skilled
Travel Agent	3.227	3.059	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Airplane Mechanic	3.622	3.318	Skilled
Manager of Supermarket	3.489	3.341	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Filling Station Attendant	2.135	1.960	Unskilled
Aircraft Worker	3.396	3.167	Semi-Skilled
Foreman, Factory	3.485	3.189	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Textile Mill Worker	2.478	2.329	Semi-Skilled
Shipping Clerk	2.748	2.585	Clerical and Sales
Druggist	3.636	3.459	Professional
Construction Foreman	3.471	3.225	Proprietors,Managers, Officials, Small
Sawmill Operator	2.857	2.657	Proprietors,Managers, Officials, Small
Automobile Worker	2.865	2.602	Semi-Skilled
Welder	3.355	3.063	Skilled
Locomotive Engineer	3.347	3.074	Skilled
Airline Pilot	4.224	4.065	Semi-Professional
Truck Dispatcher	2.771	2.519	Clerical and Sales
Construction Laborer	2.665	2.421	Unskilled
Surveyor	3.375	3.239	Semi-Professional
Farm Owner and Operator	3.613	3.358	Farmer
Air Hostess	3.274	3.062	Clerical and Sales

Continued..

Table B.1 (Con't).

Occupation	Rural Mean	Urban Mean	Occupational Classification
Colonel in the Army	3.493	3.298	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Bricklayer	2.755	2.566	Skilled
Service Station Manager	3.012	2.831	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
File Clerk	2.790	2.529	Clerical and Sales
Farm Laborer	2.684	2.484	Farmer
Musician in a Symphony Orchestra	3.268	3.484	Semi-Professional
Physician	4.267	4.425	Professional
Member of Canadian Senate	4.200	4.000	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Large
Telephone Solicitor	2.509	2.239	Clerical and Sales
Pig Farmer	2.867	2.514	Farmer
Manufacturer's Representative	3.261	3.085	Clerical and Sales
Trailer Truck Driver	2.814	2.665	Semi-Skilled
Social Worker	3.428	3.270	Semi-Professional
Dairy Farmer	3.390	3.039	Farmer
Carpenter's Helper	2.693	2.500	Unskilled
Beauty Operator	2.746	2.549	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Automobile Repairman	3.004	2.809	Semi-Skilled
Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	3.632	3.464	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Production Worker in Electronics Industry	3.161	2.812	Semi-Skilled
Driving Instructor	2.983	2.754	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Policeman	3.843	3.645	Semi-Skilled
Taxicab Driver	2.403	2.258	Unskilled
Machine Set-Up Man in a Factory	2.686	2.506	Skilled
House Carpenter	3.215	2.972	Skilled
Diamond Driller	3.203	2.951	Skilled
Steamroller Operator	2.696	2.552	Semi-Skilled
Power Crane Operator	2.875	2.691	Skilled
Baker	2.807	2.655	Skilled
Hospital Attendant	2.901	2.766	Unskilled
Oilfield Worker	3.024	2.814	Semi-Skilled
Part-time Farmer	2.866	2.696	Farmer
Private in the Army	2.714	2.455	Semi-Skilled
Veterinarian	4.057	3.823	Professional

Continued...

Table B.1 (Con't).

Occupation	Rural Mean	Urban Mean	Occupational Classification
Electrician	3.771	3.566	Skilled
Job Counsellor	3.138	2.932	Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Small
Machine Operator in a Factory	2.640	2.437	Semi-Skilled
Steel Mill Worker	2.738	2.541	Semi-Skilled
Sheet Metal Worker	2.845	2.635	Skilled
Machinist	3.062	2.833	Skilled
Receptionist	2.963	2.835	Clerical and Sales
Tool and Die Maker	2.814	2.620	Skilled
Assembly Line Worker	2.288	2.071	Semi-Skilled

Table B.2

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PRESTIGE ASSIGNMENT BY OCCUPATION TOTAL MALE AND FEMALE

Occupation	Male Mean	Female Mean
* YMCA Director	2.885	3.199
* Typist	2.744	3.025
* Clerk in an Office	2.673	2.970
* Medical/Dental Technician	3.981	4.155
Waitress in a Restaurant	2.136	1.904
Mailman	2.675	2.842
* Bank Teller	3.056	3.334
Mechandise Buyer for a Department Store	3.180	3.331
* Stenographer	2.891	3.255
Bank Manager	4.018	4.246
Physicist	4.057	4.366
* Research Technician	3.811	4.168
Steam Boiler Fireman	2.447	2.639
Coal Miner	2.210	2.384
* Registered Nurse	3.545	4.113
* Architect	4.134	4.428
* Telephone Operator	2.643	2.804

(Continued)...

Table B.2 (Con't)

	Occupation	Male Mean	Female Mean
	Biologist	3.756	4.131
*	Professionally Trained Libraian	2.867	3.675
	General Manager of a Manufacturing Plant	3.817	3.675
*	Public Grade School Teacher	3.207	3.623
*	Travel Agent	3.026	3.273
*	Playgound Director	2.425	2.802
	Public Relations Manager	3.318	3.465
*	Custom Seamstress	2.666	2.841
	Filling Station Attendant	2.139	1.939
	Govt. Purchasing Agent	3.250	3.497
	Logger	2.600	2.456
*	Druggist	3.359	3.757
	Mathematician	3.626	3.900
	Welder	3.134	3.288
	Locomotive Engineer	3.139	3.285
	Firefighter	3.254	3.491
	Journalist	3.177	3.476
*	Accountant	3.522	3.842
*	Air Hostess	3.033	3.316
	Colonel in the Army	3.274	3.535
*	Protestant Minister	3.007	3.266
*	Psychologist	3.756	4.254
	Dept. Head in City Government	3.899	4.118
	Service Station Manager	3.022	2.805
	Laundress	2.200	2.013
*	Sculptor	2.973	3.159
*	University Professor	3.940	4.257
*	File Clerk	2.581	2.742
	Chemist	3.759	4.008
*	Ballet Dancer	2.865	3.258
*	Lawyer	4.358	4.540
*	Physician	4.218	4.495
	Chiropractor	3.623	4.000
	Economist	3.420	3.642
*	Commercial Artist	3.360	3.579
	Trailer Truck Driver	2.847	2.611
*	Social Worker	3.048	3.682
*	Bookkeeper	2.834	3.051
	Computer Programmer	3.473	3.661
	Automobile Repairman	2.981	2.817
*	Physiotherapist	3.763	4.159
	Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	3.418	3.688

(Continued)...

Table B.2 (Con't)

Occupation	Male Mean	Female Mean
Funeral Director	2.752	2.561
* Policeman	3.564	3.940
* Professional Babysitter	2.128	2.321
* High School Teacher	3.109	3.459
Butcher in a Store	2.754	2.578
Machine Set-Up Man in a Factory	2.658	2.518
* Catholic Priest	2.944	3.149
* Hospital Attendant	2.694	2.987
* Post Office Clerk	2.633	2.843
Ship's Pilot	3.488	3.643
Newspaper Pressman	2.620	2.760
* County Court Judge	3.703	3.953
* Private in the Army	2.396	2.790
* Veterinarian	3.780	4.115
Electronics	3.539	3.807
Saw Sharpener	2.207	1.963
* Job Counsellor	2.902	3.186
* Receptionist	2.760	3.055
Tool and Die Maker	2.796	2.608

* Indicates occupations in the Arts: helping, teaching, caring and protective realm, or occupations which are traditionally female, to which females would have good accessability.

Table B.3

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PRESTIGE ASSIGNMENT
BY OCCUPATION FEMALE URBAN AND FEMALE RURAL

Occupation	Female Urban Mean	Female Rural Mean
YMCA Director	2.971	3.400
Typist	2.873	3.158
Clerk in an Office	2.809	3.112
Mine Safety Analyst	3.252	3.586
Disc Jockey	3.074	3.424
* Superintendant of a Construction Job	3.379	3.617
Travel Agent	3.168	3.365
* Airplane Mechanic	3.373	3.624
* Aircraft Worker	3.175	3.467
* Foreman in a Factory	3.175	3.396
Druggist	3.618	3.880
* Sawmill Operator	2.537	2.832
* Automobile Worker	2.542	2.822
* Welder	3.149	3.408
Truck Dispatcher	2.457	2.743
Surveyor	3.222	3.438
* Farm Owner and Operator	3.263	3.672
Air Hostess	3.162	3.456
Colonel in the Army	3.352	3.694
File Clerk	2.564	2.896
Telephone Solicitor	2.235	2.537
* Pig Farmer	2.476	2.935
Manufacturer's Representative	3.019	3.241
Bill Collector	2.533	2.306
* Dairy Farmer	3.028	3.436
Computer Programmer	3.545	3.761
Beauty Operator	2.579	2.814
* Automobile Repairman	2.700	2.920
* Production Worker (Electronics Industry)	2.826	3.155
* Taxicab Driver	2.180	2.406
* Machine Set-Up Man in a Factory	2.393	2.623
* Diamond Driller	2.873	3.226
* Steamroller Operator	2.523	2.720
* Power Crane Operator	2.669	2.850
Bookkeeper	2.359	2.150
Veterinarian	4.000	4.216
* Machine Operator in a Factory	2.429	2.637

* Indicates occupations which are traditionally male, from the farming; small proprietors, managers, and officials, skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled categories.

Table B.4

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PRESTIGE ASSIGNMENT BY OCCUPATION
MALE RURAL AND MALE URBAN

Occupation	Male Rural Mean	Male Urban Mean
* Paper Making Machine Tender	2.305	2.029
* Commercial Farmer	3.666	3.246
Bank Teller	3.200	2.938
Superintendant of Construction Job	3.783	3.439
* Power Lineman	2.991	2.741
* Worker in a Dry Cleaning or Laundry Plant	2.025	1.833
* Mucking Machine Operator	2.356	2.077
* Airplane Mechanic	3.619	3.278
* Filling Station Attendant	2.305	2.000
Foreman in Factory	3.578	3.198
* Textile-Mill Worker	2.554	2.360
Shipping Clerk	2.741	2.582
Construction Foreman	3.575	3.243
* Automobile Worker	2.909	2.646
Used Car Salesman	2.661	2.364
* Welder	3.300	3.000
* Locomotive Engineer	3.316	3.125
Truck Dispatcher	2.800	2.564
* Construction Laborer	2.728	2.353
* Bricklayer	2.892	2.575
Service Station Manager	3.173	2.895
Musician in a Symphony Orchestra	3.152	3.433
Telephone Solicitor	2.481	2.243
Advertising Executive	3.400	3.585
* Trailer Truck Driver	2.975	2.743
Author	3.375	3.641
* Dairy Farmer	3.341	3.047
* Carpenter's Helper	2.789	2.500
* Automobile Repairman	3.092	2.891
* Production Worker, Electronics	3.166	2.801
Driving Instructor	2.975	2.705
* House Carpenter	3.216	2.932
* Power Crane Operator	2.900	2.707
* Oilfield Worker	3.101	2.726
* Part-time Farmer	2.931	2.695
* Private in the Army	2.522	2.295
* Electrician	3.683	3.424
* Machine Operator in Factory	2.644	2.442
* Steel Mill Worker	2.785	2.496

(Continued)...

Table B.4 (Con't)

Occupation	Male Rural Mean	Male Urban Mean
* Sheet Metal Worker	2.884	2.568
* Machinist	3.110	2.758
* Assembly-Line Worker	2.411	2.095

* Indicates traditionally male occupations from the farming, skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled categories.

Table B.5

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PRESTIGE ASSIGNMENT BY OCCUPATION
FEMALE URBAN AND MALE RURAL

Occupation	Female Urban Mean	Male Urban Mean
Housekeeper in Private Home	2.564	2.261
Commercial Farmer	3.367	3.666
Waitress in a Restaurant	1.943	2.150
Owner of a Manufacturing Plant	4.038	4.279
Disc Jockey	3.074	3.339
** Superintendant of a Construction Job	3.379	3.783
Mechandise Buyer for a Department Store	3.367	3.082
Stenographer	3.209	2.872
* Physicist	4.339	4.017
* Research Technician	4.056	3.773
* Registered Nurse	4.081	3.529
* Architect	4.381	4.083
** Mucking Machine Operator	1.982	2.356
* Biologist	4.074	3.758
** Worker in a Meat Packing Plant	2.165	2.504
General Manager of a Manufacturing Plant	3.579	3.867
* Public Grade School Teacher	3.660	3.211
* Playground Director	2.796	2.411
** Airplane Mechanic	3.373	3.619
** Filling Station Attendant	1.906	2.305
** Foreman in a Factory	3.175	3.578
** Textile Mill Worker	2.285	2.554

(Continued)...

Table B.5 (Con't)

Occupation	Female Urban Mean	Male Urban Mean
** Construction Foreman	3.201	3.575
** Sawmill Operator	2.537	2.883
** Automobile Worker	2.542	2.909
* Mathematician	3.906	3.575
Truck Dispatcher	2.457	2.800
** Firefighter	3.532	3.191
Journalist	3.458	3.201
Farm Owner and Operator	3.263	3.553
* Accountant	3.770	3.491
* Protestant Minister	3.323	2.912
* Psychologist	4.192	3.683
** Bricklayer	2.555	2.892
** Service Station Manager	2.747	3.173
Laundress	2.009	2.279
* University Professor	4.216	3.900
Stockroom Attendant	2.218	2.412
* Ballet Dancer	3.367	2.747
* Musician in a Symphony Orchestra	3.549	3.152
* Physician	4.572	4.100
* Chiropractor	4.009	3.675
Telephone Solicitor	2.235	2.481
Pig Farmer	2.476	2.798
Manufacturer's Representative	3.019	3.281
Advertising Executive	3.663	3.400
* Economist	3.703	3.406
* Commercial Artist	3.541	3.291
** Trailer Truck Driver	2.556	2.975
* Author	3.660	3.375
* Social Worker	3.585	3.067
Dairy Farmer	3.028	3.341
** Carpenter's Helper	2.500	2.789
** Automobile Repairman	2.700	3.092
* Physiotherapist	4.150	3.787
** Production Worker in Electronics Factory	2.826	3.166
** Taxicab Driver	2.180	2.400
* High School Teacher	3.441	3.058
** Butcher in a Store	2.572	2.789
** Machine Set-Up Man in a Factory	2.393	2.750
** Quarry Worker	2.373	2.589
** Diamond Driller	2.873	3.179
** Power Crane Operator	2.669	2.900
Newspaper Pressman	2.861	2.655

(Continued)....

Table B.5 (Con't)

Occupation	Female Urban Mean	Male Urban Mean
Part-time Farmer	2.698	2.931
** Saw Sharpener	1.971	2.232
** Machine Operator in a Factory	2.429	2.644
Receptionist	3.000	2.818
** Tool and Die Maker	2.515	2.924
** Assembly Line Worker	2.038	2.411

* Indicates occupations from the professional, semi-professional categories.

** Indicates occupations from the small proprietors, managers, and officals; skilled; semi-skilled; and unskilled categories.

Table B.6

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PRESTIGE ASSIGNMENT BY OCCUPATION
FEMALE RURAL AND MALE URBAN

Occupation	Female Rural Mean	Male Urban Mean
YMCA Director	3.400	2.748
** Typist	3.158	2.687
** Clerk in an Office	3.113	2.593
* Paper Making Machine Tender	2.285	2.029
* Commercial Farmer	3.554	3.246
Mine Safety Analyst	3.586	3.330
Waitress in a Restaurant	1.869	2.125
** Bank Teller	3.384	2.938
Disc Jockey	3.424	3.138
** Stenographer	3.297	2.906
Bank Manager	4.296	3.993
Physicist	4.390	4.089
Research Technician	4.266	3.842
* Coal Miner	2.382	2.143
Registered Nurse	4.142	3.557

(Continued)....

Table B.6 (Con't)

Occupation	Female Rural Mean	Male Urban Mean
Architect	4.468	4.175
** Telephone Operator	2.880	2.569
Biologist	4.181	3.755
Professionally Trained Libraian	3.217	2.816
Public Grade School Teacher	3.592	3.204
* Travel Agent	3.365	2.979
Playground Director	2.808	2.436
* Public Relations Man	3.504	3.299
** Custom Seamstress	2.872	2.671
* Airplane Mechanic	3.624	3.278
* Aircraft Worker	3.467	3.160
* Foreman in a Factory	3.396	3.198
* Govt. Purchasing Agent	3.508	3.215
Druggist	3.880	3.340
* Automobile Worker	2.822	2.646
Mathematician	3.895	3.669
* Welder	3.408	3.000
* Locomotive Engineer	3.377	2.998
Airline Pilot	4.238	4.033
Truck Operator	2.743	2.564
* Construction Laborer	2.604	2.353
Journalist	3.491	3.157
* Farm Owner and Operator	3.672	3.428
Accountant	3.904	3.547
** Air Hostess	3.455	2.986
Colonel in the Army	3.694	3.260
Psychologist	4.308	3.815
T.V. Star	3.861	4.137
Dept. Head in City Govt.	4.134	3.891
University Professor	4.293	3.973
** File Clerk	2.896	2.503
Chemist	4.096	3.775
* Farm Laborer	2.728	2.441
Lawyer	4.600	4.401
Chiropractor	3.991	3.580
Member of Canadian Senate	4.282	3.965
** Telephone Solicitor	2.537	2.243
* Pig Farmer	2.935	2.541
Commerical Artist	3.612	3.417
Social Worker	3.768	3.033
Real Estate Agent	3.301	3.114
* Dairy Farmer	3.436	3.047
** Bookkeeper	3.087	2.821
Computer Programmer	3.761	3.513

(Continued).....

Table B.6 (Con't)

Occupation	Female Rural Mean	Male Urban Mean
Beauty Operator	2.814	2.525
Physiotherapist	4.168	3.746
Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	3.766	3.359
* Production Worker, Industry	3.155	2.801
* Driving Instructor	2.992	2.705
* Policeman	4.024	3.493
** Professional Babysiter	2.334	2.130
High School Teacher	3.476	3.150
* House Carpenter	3.214	2.932
Diamond Driller	3.226	3.007
* Baker	2.825	2.635
* Hospital Attendant	3.024	2.630
Post Office Clerk	2.912	2.628
Ship's Pilot	3.669	3.454
* Oilfield Worker	2.952	2.726
County Court Judge	4.031	3.753
* Private in the Army	2.888	2.295
Veterinarian	4.216	3.691
* Electrician	3.854	3.424
Saw Sharpener	1.957	2.187
Job Counsellor	3.280	2.828
* Machine Operator in a Factory	2.637	2.442
* Steel Mill Worker	2.693	2.496
* Sheet Metal Worker	2.808	2.568
* Machinist	3.016	2.758

* Indicates traditionally male occupations in small proprietors, managers, and officials, farming, skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled categories.

** Indicates traditionally female occupations from clerical, skilled and semi-skilled categories.

Table B.7

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PRESTIGE ASSIGNMENT BY OCCUPATION
MALE URBAN AND FEMALE URBAN

Occupation	Male Urban Mean	Female Urban Mean
* YMCA Director	2.748	2.971
Clerk in an Office	2.593	2.809
Mailman	2.643	2.872
Bank Teller	2.938	3.279
Stenographer	2.906	3.209
Bank Manager	3.993	4.190
* Physicist	4.089	4.339
* Research Technican	3.842	4.056
Steam Boiler Fireman	2.394	2.676
Coal Miner	2.143	2.386
* Registered Nurse	3.557	4.081
* Architect	4.175	4.381
* Biologist	3.755	4.074
* Professionally Trained Libraian	2.816	3.163
* Public Grade School Teacher	3.204	3.660
* Playground Director	2.436	2.796
Govt. Purchasing Agent	3.215	3.486
* Druggist	3.340	3.618
Sawmill Operator	2.746	2.537
* Mathematician	3.669	3.906
Firefighter	3.306	3.532
* Journalist	3.157	3.458
* Accountant	3.547	3.770
* Psychologist	3.815	4.192
* University Professor	3.973	4.216
* Ballet Dancer	2.957	3.367
* Physician	4.315	4.572
* Chiropractor	3.580	4.009
Member of City Council	3.632	3.872
I.B.M. Keypunch Operator	2.784	3.018
* Economist	3.431	3.703
* Social Worker	3.033	3.585
Automobile Repairman	2.891	2.700
* Physiotherapist	3.746	4.150
Administrative Officier in Federal Civil Service	3.359	3.601
Policeman	3.493	3.846
* High School Teacher	3.150	3.441
Hospital Attendant	2.630	2.945

(Continued).....

Table B.7 (Con't)

Occupation	Male Urban Mean	Female Urban Mean
Trade Union Business Agent	3.055	3.274
Newspaper Pressman	2.593	2.861
Oilfield Worker	2.726	2.934
Private in the Army	2.295	2.673
* Veterinarian	3.691	4.000
Electrician	3.424	3.754
Saw Sharpener	2.187	1.971
Job Counsellor	2.828	3.075
Machinist	2.758	2.940
Receptionist	2.712	3.000

* Indicates occupations from professional and semi-professional categories.

Table B.8

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PRESTIGE ASSIGNMENT BY OCCUPATION
MALE RURAL AND FEMALE RURAL

Occupation	Male Rural Mean	Female Rural Mean
* YMCA Director	3.063	3.400
Typist	2.817	3.158
Clerk in an Office	2.771	3.113
* Medical/Dental Technician	3.933	4.161
** Waitress in a Restaurant	2.150	1.869
** Warehouse Hand	2.302	2.073
Merchandise Buyer for a Dept. Store	3.082	3.300
Stenographer	2.872	3.297
Bank Manager	4.049	4.296
* Physicist	4.017	4.390
* Research Technician	3.773	4.266
* Registered Nurse	3.529	4.142
* Architect	4.083	4.468
* Biologist	3.758	4.181
* Professionally Trained Libraian	2.932	3.217
* Public Grade School Teacher	3.211	3.592
Travel Agent	3.084	3.365

(Continued)...

Table B.8 (Con't).

Occupation	Male Rural Mean	Female Rural Mean
Playground Director	2.411	2.808
** Filling Station Attendant	2.305	1.967
Foreman in a Factory	3.578	3.396
Govt. Purchasing Agent	3.291	3.508
* Druggist	3.383	3.880
Construction Foreman	3.575	3.373
* Mathematician	3.575	3.895
Used Car Salesman	2.611	2.341
Firefighter	3.191	3.455
* Journalist	3.201	3.491
* Accountant	3.491	3.904
Air Hostess	3.090	3.455
Colonel in the Army	3.291	3.694
* Protestant Minister	2.912	3.219
* Psychologist	3.683	4.308
** Bricklayer	2.892	2.621
Service Station Manager	3.173	2.857
** Laundress	2.279	2.016
* Sculptor	2.907	3.209
* University Professor	3.900	4.293
File Clerk	2.678	2.896
* Chemist	3.739	4.096
* Lawyer	4.305	4.600
* Physician	4.100	4.427
* Chiropractor	3.675	3.991
* Commercial Artist	3.291	3.612
** Trailer Truck Driver	2.975	2.658
* Author	3.375	3.704
* Social Worker	3.067	3.768
Bookkeeper	2.850	3.087
* Computer Programmer	3.423	3.761
** Garbage Collector	2.094	1.824
** Automobile Repairman	3.092	2.920
* Physiotherapist	3.787	4.168
Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	3.491	3.776
Policeman	3.652	4.024
* High School Teacher	3.058	3.476
** Butcher in a Store	2.789	2.584
** Quarry Worker	2.589	2.390
* Catholic Priest	2.840	2.390
Hospital Attendant	2.773	3.024

(Continued)...

Table B.8 (Con't)

Occupation	Male Rural Mean	Female Rural Mean
Post Office Clerk	2.638	2.912
** Pumphouse Engineer	2.912	2.650
* County Court Judge	3.641	4.031
Private in the Army	2.522	2.888
* Veterinarian	3.889	4.216
** Saw Sharpener	2.232	1.957
Job Counsellor	2.991	3.280
Receptionist	2.818	3.103
** Tool and Die Maker	2.924	2.691
** Assembly Line Worker	2.411	2.166

* Indicates occupations from professional and semi-professional categories.

** Indicates higher rural male ratings from semi-skilled, skilled, and unskilled categories.

APPENDIX C

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PRESTIGE COMPARISONS

NOTE: NORC prestige scores are on a scale of 1 to 100, as are those of Pineo and Porter. Scores for occupations in the Inkles and Rossi study are on a scale of 1 to 100, and their rankings on a scale of 1 to 11. Since this study was interested in comparing rankings of occupations rather than prestige scores, it was viewed as unnecessary to convert differences into standard scores.

APPENDIX C

TABLE C.1

EDMONTON VICINITY AND NORC PRESTIGE COMPARISONS*

NORC Occupation	Score	Edmonton Vicinity Occupation	Score
Physician	93	Physician	4.349
State Governor	93	Provincial Premier	4.358
Cabinet Member, Federal Govt.	92	Member of Canadian Cabinet	4.211
Mayor, Large City	90	Mayor, Large City	
College Professor	89	University Professor	4.089
U.S. Representative in Congress	89	Can. House of Commons Member	4.189
Banker	88	Bank Manager	
County Judge	87	County Court Judge	3.821
Head, Dept. in State Govt.	87	Ad. Officier, Fed. Civil Ser.	3.545
Minister	87	Protestant Minister	3.130
Architect	86	Architect	4.272
Chemist	86	Chemist	3.876
Lawyer	86	Lawyer	4.443
Member of Board of Directors, Large Corporation	86	General Manager, Manufacturing Plant	3.752
Nuclear Physicist	86	Physicist	4.202
Priest	86	Catholic Priest	3.042
Psychologist	85	Psychologist	3.990
Civil Engineer	84	Civil Engineer	3.731
Airline Pilot	83	Airline Pilot	4.143
Artist, Exhibits in Galleries	83	Commercial Artist	3.463
Owner of Factory, Employees +100	82	Owner, Manufacturing Plant	4.190
Accountant, Large Business	81	Accountant	3.673
Biologist	81	Biologist	3.931
Musician, Symphony Orchestra	81	Musician, Symphony Orchestra	3.379
Author of Novels	80	Author	3.597
Building Contractor	79	Building Contractor	3.500
Economist	79	Economist	3.524
Public School Teacher	78	Public Grade School Teacher	3.403
Farm Owner and Operator	76	Farm Owner and Operator	3.483
Official, International Labour Union	75	Trade Union Business Agent	3.180
Radio Announcer	75	T.V. Announcer	3.408
Electrician	73	Electrician	3.666
Trained Machinist	73	Machinist	2.947

* Columns One and NORC Occupational Titles adapted from North Cecil and Paul K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluations" in Wilson, Logan and William L. Kolb, Sociological Analysis (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949), p. 446.

Table C.2

EDMONTON VICINITY AND INKLES AND ROSSI INTERNATIONAL PRESTIGE COMPARISONS*

Place	Occupation	Score/Rank
UNITED STATES	Physician	93
	Head of Department in State Government	87
	Minister	87
	Member of Board of Directors, Large Corp.	86
	Instructor in Public School	78
	Farm Owner and Operator	76
	Bookkeeper	68
	Insurance Agent	68
	Carpenter	65
	Clerk in a Store	58
	Farm Hand	50
GERMANY	Doctor	11
	High Civil Servant	10
	Minister	8
	Factory Director	9
	Elementary School Teacher	7
	Farmer	6
	Bank Teller	4
	Insurance Agent	3
	Carpenter	5
	Store Clerk	2
	Farm Laborer	1
GREAT BRITAIN	Medical Officer	11
	Civil Servant	9
	Non-Conformist Minister	8
	Company Director	10
	Elementary School Teacher	6
	Farmer	7
	Routine Clerk	4
	Insurance Agent	5
	Carpenter	3
	Shop Assistant	2
	Agricultural Laborer	1

(Continued...)

Table C.2 (Con't)

Place	Occupation	Score/Rank
NEW ZEALAND	Medical Officer	11
	Civil Servant	8
	Non-Conformist Minister	9
	Company Director	10
	Elementary School Teacher	6
	Farmer	7
	Routine Clerk	4
	Insurance Agent	5
	Carpenter	3
	Shop Assistant	2
	Agricultural Laborer	1
JAPAN	Doctor	9.5
	Section Head of a Government Office	9.5
	Preist of a Buddhist Temple	7.0
	Officer of Large Company	11.0
	Elementary School Teacher	8.0
	Small Independent Farmer	5.0
	Company Office Clerk	6.0
	Insurance Agent	2.5
	Carpenter	2.5
	Department Store Clerk	4.0
EDMONTON AND VICINITY	Physician	4.349
	Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	3.545
	Protestant Minister	3.130
	General Manager of Manufacturing Plant	3.752
	Public School School Teacher	3.403
	Farm Owner and Operator	3.483
	Bookkeeper	2.936
	Insurance Agent	3.248
	House Carpenter	3.091
	Sales Clerk in Store	2.619
	Farm Laborer	2.582

* Scores for United States and Occupational Titles for United States, Germany, Great Britain and Japan are adopted from A. Inkles and P.H. Rossi, "National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige" in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXI (July 1955-May 1956), pp. 336-337.

Table C.3

EDMONTON VICINITY AND PINEO AND PORTER PRESTIGE COMPARISONS*

Occupational Title	Pineo & Porter National N = 793		Edmonton Vicinity N = 506	
	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.
Professional				
Accountant	63.4	19.2	3.673	.897
Architect	78.1	18.3	4.272	.769
Biologist	72.6	20.9	3.931	.905
Catholic Priest	72.8	25.5	3.042	1.070
Chemist	73.5	19.3	3.876	.884
Civil Engineer	73.1	19.0	3.731	.843
County Court Judge	82.5	18.6	3.821	.977
Druggist	69.3	20.0	3.546	.797
Economist	62.2	22.3	3.524	.786
High School Teacher	66.1	20.7	3.274	.845
Lawyer	82.3	16.7	4.443	.739
Mathematician	72.7	20.1	3.754	.968
Mine Safety Analyst	57.1	20.5	3.415	.932
Mining Engineer	68.8	20.5	3.452	.909
Physician	87.2	15.9	4.349	.864
Physicist	77.6	21.4	4.202	.872
Protestant Minister	67.8	26.3	3.130	1.069
Psychologist	74.9	20.3	3.990	.892
Publi Grade School Teacher	59.6	20.5	3.403	.819
University Professor	84.6	17.3	4.089	.879
Veterinarian	66.7	21.3	3.938	.852
Semi-Professional				
Airline Pilot	66.1	20.5	4.143	.817
Author	64.8	21.7	3.597	.963
Ballet Dancer	49.1	26.2	3.054	1.119
Chiropractor	68.4	22.0	3.797	.981
Commerical Artist	57.2	20.5	3.463	.814
Computer Programmer	53.8	21.6	3.562	.814
Disc Jockey	38.0	23.1	3.245	.963
Draughtsman	60.0	20.6	3.293	.892
Funeral Director	54.9	23.7	2.665	.976
Jazz Musician	40.9	24.5	3.047	1.036
Journalist	60.9	20.0	3.317	.827
Medical/Dental Technician	67.5	21.7	4.062	.802
Musician	52.1	22.9	3.151	.935
Musician, Symphony Orchestra	56.0	23.0	3.379	1.034

* Occupational Titles and Column two adopted from P.C. Pineo and John Porter, "Occupational Prestige: Canada: in Rural Sociology Vol. 34 (1969), pp. 64-68.

(Continued...)

Table C.3 (Con't)

Occupational Title	Pineo & Porter National N = 793 Score	S.D.	Edmonton Vicinity N = 506 Score	S.D.
Physiotherapist	72.1	19.4	3.956	.803
Playground Director	42.8	22.3	2.603	.908
Professional Athlete	54.1	24.2	3.881	.938
Professionally Trained Forester	60.0	20.6	3.533	.789
Professionally Trained Librarian	58.1	21.7	3.020	.871
Registered Nurse	64.7	21.4	3.813	.847
Research Technician	66.9	19.1	3.978	.849
Sculptor	56.9	23.6	3.061	1.031
Social Worker	55.1	24.0	3.347	.891
Surveyor	62.0	20.4	3.305	.746
T.V. Announcer	57.6	21.6	3.408	.903
T.V. Cameraman	48.3	21.4	3.189	.696
T.V. Director	62.1	21.5	3.591	.801
T.V. Star	65.6	26.8	3.974	1.063
YMCA Director	58.2	21.8	3.033	.873
Proprietors, Managers, Officials, Large				
Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	68.8	20.1	3.545	.899
Advertising Executive	56.5	21.8	4.125	.785
Bank Manager	70.9	19.3	3.556	.766
Building Contractor	56.5	19.3	3.500	.788
Colonel in the Army	70.8	22.0	3.394	1.090
Dept. Head in City Govt.	71.3	21.3	4.002	.906
Gen. Manager of a Manufacturing Plant	69.1	19.2	3.752	.783
Mayor of a Large City	79.9	20.4	4.312	.970
Member of Canadian Cabinet	83.3	19.9	4.211	1.006
Member of Canadian House of Commons	84.8	18.8	4.189	.971
Member of Canadian Senate	86.1	21.1	4.098	1.002
Merchandise Buyer of a Department Store	51.1	19.3	3.251	.828
Owner, Manufacturing Plant	69.4	21.3	4.190	.876
Provincial Premier	89.9	18.1	4.358	1.000
Wholesale Distributor	47.9	20.5	3.008	.716

(Continued...)

Table C.3 (Con't)

Occupational Title	Pineo & Porter National N = 793 Score	S.D.	Edmonton Vicinity N = 506 Score	
Proprietors, Managers, and Officials, Small				
Advertising Copy Writer	48.9	20.6	2.866	.717
Beauty Operator	35.2	20.9	2.646	.752
Construction Foreman	51.1	20.0	3.346	.725
Driving Instructor	41.6	21.6	2.867	.752
Foreman in Factory	50.9	19.3	3.335	.701
Govt. Purchasing Agent	56.8	21.6	3.365	.794
Insurance Claims Investigator	51.1	20.1	3.179	.866
Job Counsellor	58.3	20.7	3.034	.776
Livestock Buyer	39.6	21.5	3.059	.772
Lunchroom Operator	31.6	21.4	2.130	.784
Manager, Real Estate	58.3	20.9	3.840	.881
Manager, Supermarket	52.5	20.2	3.414	.815
Member, City Council	62.9	21.4	3.724	.935
Motel Owner	51.6	23.5	3.289	.851
Owner, Food Store	47.8	21.3	3.337	.811
Public Relations Man	60.5	19.4	3.387	.834
Railroad Ticket Agent	35.7	21.1	2.350	.725
Sawmill Operator	37.0	21.7	2.756	.726
Service Station Manager	41.5	20.4	2.920	.727
Ship's Pilot	59.6	22.7	3.561	.812
Superintendant, Const. Job	53.9	20.4	3.553	.806
Trade Union Business Agent	49.2	21.0	3.180	.785
Travel Agent	46.6	20.7	3.141	.790
Clerical and Sales				
Air Hostess	57.0	21.1	3.165	.849
Bank Teller	42.3	21.0	3.187	.731
Bill Collector	29.4	21.5	2.422	.851
Bookkeeper	49.4	20.2	2.936	.802
Cashier in a Supermarket	31.1	21.4	2.463	.783
Clerk in an Office	35.6	20.3	2.813	.816
File Clerk	32.7	21.2	2.657	.764
IBM Keypunch Operator	47.7	21.5	2.888	.832
Insurance Agent	47.3	19.7	3.248	.875
Manufacturer's Rep.	52.1	19.1	3.171	.771
Post Office Clerk	37.2	21.9	2.732	.669
Real Estate Agent	47.1	21.1	3.171	.764
Receptionist	38.7	20.9	2.899	.685

(Continued...)

Table C.3 (Con't)

Occupational Title	Pineo & Porter National N = 793		Edmonton Vicinity N = 506	
	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.
Sales Clerk, Store	26.5	19.7	2.619	.753
Shipping Clerk	30.9	20.1	2.665	.641
Stenographer	46.0	20.2	3.067	.759
Stockroom Attendant	25.8	19.2	2.300	.771
Telephone Operator	38.1	22.0	2.719	.790
Telephone Solicitor	26.7	23.0	2.366	.896
Travelling Salesman	40.2	21.1	2.365	.990
Truck Dispatcher	32.2	20.4	2.642	.747
Typist	41.9	20.7	2.878	.835
Used Car Salesman	31.2	21.0	2.448	.872
Skilled				
Airplane Mechanic	50.3	22.4	3.468	.848
Baker	38.9	20.5	2.729	.719
Bricklayer	36.2	21.6	2.659	.899
Butcher in a Store	34.8	20.2	2.672	.708
Coal Miner	27.6	22.1	2.291	.847
Cook in a Restaurant	29.7	21.0	2.379	.864
Custom Seamstress	33.4	20.3	2.749	.860
Diamond Driller	44.5	21.7	3.075	.877
Electrician	50.2	20.5	3.666	.829
House Carpenter	38.9	20.7	3.091	.754
House Painter	29.9	19.4	2.634	.802
Locomotive Engineer	48.9	22.2	3.207	.832
Machinist	44.2	21.9	2.947	.722
Machine Set-Up Man, Factory	42.1	21.4	2.595	.745
Mucking Machine Operator	31.5	20.5	2.172	.869
Plumber	42.6	20.8	3.373	.993
Power Crane Operator	40.2	20.7	2.780	.718
Power Lineman	40.9	21.2	2.864	.754
Pumphouse Engineer	38.9	21.8	2.774	.786
Railroad Brakeman	37.1	20.9	2.484	.792
Railroad Conductor	45.3	21.8	2.855	.728
Saw Sharpener	20.7	20.1	2.096	.782
Sheet Metal Worker	35.9	20.5	2.739	.781
T.V. Repairman	37.2	20.4	2.751	.686
Tool and Die Maker	42.5	22.2	2.715	.768
Typesetter	42.2	20.5	2.438	.771
Welder	41.8	21.5	3.206	.831

(Continued...)

Table C.3 (Con't)

Occupational Title	Pineo & Porter National N = 793 Score	S.D.	Edmonton Vicinity N = 506 Score	S.D.
Semi-Skilled				
Aircraft Worker	43.7	21.6	3.280	.816
Apprentice to a Master Craftsman	33.9	23.1	3.140	.760
Assembly Line Worker	28.2	20.4	2.178	.816
Automobile Repairman	38.1	20.8	2.904	.731
Automobile Worker	35.9	21.2	2.731	.742
Barber	39.3	20.2	2.528	.755
Bartender	20.2	19.2	2.774	.954
Book Binder	35.2	20.1	2.286	.736
Bus Driver	35.9	21.3	2.551	.784
Cod Fisherman	23.4	21.0	2.285	.827
Firefighter	43.5	24.4	3.365	.875
Fruit Packer, Cannery	23.2	20.7	2.145	.796
Logger	24.9	21.3	2.534	.800
Longshoreman	26.1	21.1	2.558	.710
Loom Operator	33.3	19.7	2.301	.734
Machine Operator, Factory	34.9	22.2	2.536	.738
Newspaper Pressman	43.0	20.6	2.686	.766
Oilfield Worker	35.3	21.9	2.917	.798
Oiler in a Ship	27.6	21.2	2.430	.781
Paper Making Machine Tender	31.6	20.4	2.170	.878
Policman	51.6	23.0	3.741	.866
Private in the Army	28.4	22.9	2.583	.921
Production Worker, Electronics Industry	50.8	23.0	2.984	.847
Professional Babysitter	25.9	22.5	2.221	.896
Quarry Worker	26.7	22.3	2.446	1.070
Sewing Machine Operator	28.2	19.9	2.073	.801
Steam Boiler Fireman	32.8	21.1	2.533	.893
Steam Roller Operator	32.2	20.7	2.623	.689
Steel Mill Worker	34.3	20.6	2.639	.752
Textile Mill Worker	28.8	19.5	2.402	.710
Timber Cruiser	40.3	22.6	2.719	.701
Trailer Truck Driver	32.8	22.0	2.738	.833
Troller	23.6	20.7	2.419	.828
Worker, Meat Packing Plant	25.2	20.3	2.346	.805
Unskilled				
Carpenter's Helper	23.1	20.0	2.594	.795
Construction Laborer	26.5	22.7	2.540	.833

(Continued...)

Table C.3 (Con't)

Occupational Title	Pineo & Porter National N = 793 Score	S.D.	Edmonton Vicinity N = 506 Score	S.D.
Elevator Operator (Bldg)	20.1	20.7	1.722	.776
Filling Station Attendant	23.3	20.3	2.046	.809
Garbage Collector	14.8	20.0	1.990	.864
Hospital Attendant	34.9	24.9	2.832	.761
Housekeeper, Private Home	28.8	23.5	2.424	.977
Janitor	17.3	19.9	1.980	.836
Laundress	19.3	20.1	2.114	.715
Mailman	36.1	23.0	2.754	.789
Museum Attendant	30.4	21.8	2.501	.807
Newspaper Peddler	14.8	19.0	1.723	.714
Railroad Sectionhand	27.3	21.8	2.273	.784
Taxicab Driver	25.1	20.3	2.329	.724
Waitress in a Restaurant	19.9	19.4	2.028	.814
Warehouse Hand	21.3	18.3	2.195	.823
Whistle Punk	18.4	21.2	2.047	.959
Worker, Dry Cleaning or Laundry Plant	20.8	19.6	1.895	.757
Farmer				
Commerical Farmer	42.0	22.3	3.449	.960
Dairy Farmer	44.2	22.9	3.212	.888
Farm Laborer	21.5	22.0	2.582	.942
Farm Owner and Operator	44.1	23.7	3.483	.938
Hog Farmer	33.0	23.6	2.688	1.041
Part-Time Farmer	25.1	22.4	2.780	.843